THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For OCTOBER, 1804.

Legum idcirco omnes Servi ſumus, ut Liberi eſſe poſſimus.

CIC.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

An Inquiry into the Principles of Harmony in Language, and of the Mechaniſm of Verſe, modern and ancient. By William Mitford, Eſq. The ſecond Edition *, with improvement and large additions.

THOUGH this is ſaid to be a ſecond edition, ſo long a period has elapſed ſince the publication of the firſt, and ſo great are the alterations and additions, that it may very well be conſidered as a new work: and beſides this, the great conſequence of the ſubject to general literature, and the high reputation the author bears in the literary world, from his excellent hiſtory of Greece, demand our peculiar attention.

At firſt ſight it may ſeem that a ſubject which lies open to our ſenſes every moment can have very little occaſion for minute inveſtigation, but when we conſider the anomalies, both in conſtruction and pronunciation, which we continually meet with in all languages, and the difficulty that particularly attends theſe languages, which, though no longer in common uſe, are familiar to every perſon in modern Europe, who has any pretenſion to the name of a man of letters, we muſt eſteem the attempt to account for thoſe anomalies, and to remove thoſe difficulties as highly intereſting to every lover of literature, but eſpecially to thoſe who cultivate the moſt pleaſing parts of it—poetry and oratory.

The pronunciation of the languages of Greece and Rome, and eſ-

* The firſt edition was publiſhed, for Blamire in the Strand, thirty years ago (1774), without the author's name.

pecially the distinctions between accent and quantity, in the composition of their verse, have been long a subject of inquiry and of controversy; to investigate this difficult and complicated subject is the chief object of the work, though in this investigation Mr. Mitford has been necessarily led to consider, as the title of it imports, the harmony of languages in general; for he is not satisfied with imagining, as some writers do, that Greek and Roman voices had different powers, and Greek and Roman ears different perceptions from the rest of the human species, and sitting down with the idea that their language, and especially their versification, possesses principles totally incomprehensible to the moderns; but conceiving that the power of utterance, and sense of hearing, like all other corporeal faculties, cannot have received any very essential change in the lapse of a few centuries in the same climate, he traces the qualities of ancient speech among the European dialects of the present day.

Mr. Mitford begins with ascertaining the different vowel sounds in the English language, clearly shewing that the long and short sound of the same vowel in speech is hardly ever marked by the same written character.

As for instance,

"Though the short sound of *a* in *fathom, passive,* and *ample* is sometimes lengthened, as in the correspondent words *father, passing,* and *example,* yet the most common long sound of *a* in English pronunciation (as in *famous, amiable,* and in all words where it is lengthened by the final *e)* is not the protracted sound of *a,* as in *can, hat,* but that of *e* in *net, set,* a circumstance this of great consequence to the harmony of the ancient language to English ears, as we carry all the irregularities of our own speech into our pronunciation of Greek and Latin."

This position, in another part of the work, is illustrated by the following story.

"Being some years ago at Rome, in company with a man of letters of that city, he desired me to repeat the beginning of the Æneid in the English way. He had heard of some of the peculiarities of the English orthography, that *a* represents with us the sound of the Italian *e,* and *e* that of the Italian *i,* but he was uninformed of its irregularities. I had scarcely therefore finished the second line, when he interrupted me; '*Arma, oris, Italiam,* bene; mà perchè poi *cheno, praimus, feto, prafugus?*' that is, why pronounce vowels in *cano, primus, fato, profugus,* differently from the same letters in *arma, oris, Italiam,* where every English scholar gives them nearly the Italian enunciation. This question he put, not at all surprized that I spoke the four words, with which he was dissatisfied, differently from the Italians, but that I pronounced the other three so nearly in the Italian manner. I answered that, in our own language those letters represented different sounds, as they were differently combined; and from habit we used the same variations of articulation in speaking Latin. 'For your own language well,' he replied, 'but why so confound the pronunciation?' I could not help answering that, to confess fairly, it was not well, even in our own language; which was in truth disgraced by gross and absurd irregularities of orthography; and it

was

was in our blindneſs to the deformity of theſe, ariſing from over familiarity, that we were led by them to perplex the ſounds of the Latin."

The author then proceeds to examine the cauſes and the effect of quantity, accent, and emphaſis in Engliſh ſpeech, and the mechaniſm of the various ſpecies of Engliſh verſe, and gives a ſhort hiſtory of the progreſs of Engliſh verſification, and then proceeds to carry the ſame inquiry into the ſame circumſtance of the ancient languages, where he takes a comprehenſive view of the celebrated diſputes concerning accent and quantity in Greek, and gives, in our opinion, a very ſatisfactory ſolution of all the difficulties that have hitherto attended that long conteſted ſubject. He then traces the decline and corruption of the antient languages, and the origin and progreſs of their offspring, the modern Greek, French, Italian, Spaniſh, Portugueze, and Romaneſk, and concludes with ſome general remarks on euphony and cacophony, and ſome obſervations on the peculiarities of the grammar of different languages.

With regard to quantity in the Engliſh language Mr. Mitford gives the following rules:

"A SYLLABLE WITH A SHORT VOWEL, FOLLOWED BY A SINGLE CONSONANT, HAS THE JUST MEASURE OF A SHORT SYLLABLE; as the firſt of *fathom:* A SYLLABLE WITH A LONG VOWEL FOLLOWED BY A SINGLE CONSONANT HAS DOUBLE THE TIME OF THE SHORT SYLLABLE, AND FILLS THE JUST MEASURE OF A LONG SYLLABLE; as the firſt of *father.*

"If ſound be added to a given ſound, the TIME of utterance, or the QUANTITY, muſt neceſſarily be increaſed. A ſyllable, therefore, with a conſonant before as well as after its vowel, muſt be longer than a ſyllable compoſed of the ſame elements, with the omiſſion of the firſt conſonant. Thus, if the ſyllable *or* has the juſt meaſure of a ſhort quantity, the ſyllable *for* ſhould have more than the juſt meaſure of a ſhort quantity. It is, however, not what may be diſcovered by analyſis and ſtudied compariſon, but what is ſtriking to a good ear, in the flow of ſpeech, that makes a difference eſſential to harmony. The time of a conſonant, preceding a vowel within the ſame ſyllable, though unqueſtionably a particle of quantity, is too much of a point, to be taken into any account of rhythmical meaſure in the flow of language, by the moſt ſcrupulous ear.

"Not ſo when two conſonants meet. Of theſe each muſt have its own action of the organs; which muſt be either ſeparated or cloſed, or both, for the diſtinct articulation of each. Thus an interval neceſſarily has place, with a delay of enunciation, not minute, and evading obſervation, but large and ſtriking to the ear. Let the words *banish, baron, venom, living, body, punish,* be compared with *banter, barter, vender, lifting, bodkin, pungent,* the firſt ſyllables in each ſet are the ſame, but the difference of time neceſſarily employed by the voice, before it can give the ſecond ſyllable to the ear, is ſtriking. The firſt ſyllables are not of themſelves long, in the ſecond ſet of examples more than in the firſt ſet; but the two conſonants requiring ſeparate articulation, the voice is neceſſarily delayed by the double operation; and before the ſecond ſyllable can be heard, a time elapſes equal to what would be requiſite for the pronunciation of a long vowel inſtead of the

ſhort one, provided only a ſingle conſonant followed. Let the words *farther, lifting, order, godly, fulsome,* be compared with *father, leaving, author, gaudy, foolish,* and the ear will not readily decide of the firſt ſyllables which are the longer. Thoſe of the former ſet, of themſelves ſhort, are made long, in the compoſition of ſpeech; employing double time, and therefore rhythmically long; not by increaſe of vowel-ſound, but by duplication of conſonant-ſound."

This ſeems perfectly in uniſon with the perceptions of the ear, which are the only criteria by which we can judge of ſounds; Mr. Mitford afterwards adds, that the reduplication of the ſame conſonant, though it is ſaid in antient proſody to lengthen the ſyllable by poſition; in Engliſh, and in Engliſh pronunciation of Greek and Latin, it has only the effect of ſhortening the preceding vowel; and this is no ſmall ſource of the errors we make with regard to quantity in reading antient verſe. The Greeks and Romans, like the modern Italian, without doubt marked both the conſonants, but the only difference we make between the firſt ſyllable of vĕlim and vēllem is giving the ſhort ſyllable the long ſound of *eta*, and the long ſyllable the ſhort ſound of *epſilon*.

In the following rule we cannot entirely agree with the author:

"A ſyllable whoſe vowel is followed by a vowel, has, in Engliſh ſpeech, never more than the ſhort quantity. Even of the diphthongs, the third only has neceſſary extenſion of ſound ſufficient, without the ſupport of a following conſonant, to make a long ſyllable. Its ſuperiority will be obvious to the ear in a compariſon of the words *dial, dual, fewer, vowel, royal, joyous:* the firſt ſyllable of the two laſt words only is long.

It appears to us, that a diphthong, or even a long vowel, may make a long quantity without the ſupport of a ſucceeding conſonant. Surely length of quantity will not be denied to the firſt word of this verſe:

Die of a roſe in aromatic pain.

One obſervation occurs to us here; neither Mr. Mitford, nor any other writer, that we recollect, have noticed the power of the ſemi-vowel *r*, in giving an additional ſhort vowel ſound after all the long vowels, except *au*, that preceed it. This will be beſt exemplified by comparing it in this reſpect with the congenial ſemi-vowel *l*; *feel, fear*; *file, fire*; *ſole, ſore*; *pool, poor*; *mule, pure*. Mr. Mitford has obſerved before, in page 31, that the rough conſonant *r* changes *e* and *i* into the ſhort ſound of *u*, as pronounced in *but, dull*, and inſtances *err, defer, ſir, ſtir*; but the above examples ſhew it adds the ſame ſhort ſound to the vowels *e, i, o, u*, when they are long; and ſo ſtrong is this effect, that our older poets often give ſuch ſounds as two ſyllables. I believe few voices diſtinguiſh much in pronouncing *lyre* and *liar*, and though perhaps modern poets might be juſtified in uſing the laſt word as a monoſyllable, and making it rhyme with *fire*, &c. Shakeſpeare uſes it as a diſſyllable,—

"She is like a liar gone to burning hell—
Liar and ſlave."

The

The author then proceeds to notice the effect of accent in Engliſh pronunciation, which is obvious to every perſon who ſpeaks the language with propriety; and having ſhewn, beyond the power of controverſy, that it is the efficient of Engliſh, and all modern verſification, proceeds to examine what arrangement of it is eſſential in the different ſpecies of Engliſh verſe to diſtinguiſh it from proſe. He obſerves, that in the firſt foot of an heroic* verſe, the accent may equally fall on the firſt or ſecond ſyllable; but that, though poets ſometimes have taken the ſame liberty with other feet, it can there only be uſed very ſparingly, and on particular occaſions, and that the general rule to which there are very few exceptions, requires the accent on the laſt ſyllable of every foot. Indeed, the only inſtances in which the *aberration* of accent, as Mr. Mitford terms it, can be at all tolerated in any other foot than the firſt, are when it follows a ſtrongly marked pauſe in which the next foot will ſeem the firſt of a verſe of eight or ſix ſyllables, and this is the reaſon why the anomaly is more frequent and leſs offenſive to the ear in blank verſe than in rhymed verſe, and in dramatic blank verſe than in epic.

Mr. Mitford gives the firſt line of the Paradiſe Loſt as an example of the accent on the firſt ſyllable of the ſecond foot,

"Of man's firſt diſobedience and the fruit—"

for he ſays, "the ſecondary acute on the firſt ſyllable of diſobedience ſinks under the impreſſion made by the preceding emphatical ſyllables *man* and *firſt*;" on this propoſition we muſt diſſent from Mr. Mitford; *man* is out of the queſtion, being in another foot, but as to *firſt* no emphaſis, except in feet conſiſting of monoſyllables, will, for the purpoſe of verſe, give ſufficient accent to overcome the ſlighteſt accent of a polyſyllable; even among monoſyllables, if the metrical accent falls on the adjective inſtead of the ſubſtantive, though aided by emphaſis, it gives a particular character to the verſe, which, though much uſed by ſome modern writers, and eſpecially by Dr. Darwin, is not pleaſant when of frequent occurrence; though ſparingly uſed it gives a variety from the reduplication of the accent: it is not uncommon in Milton, even in his rhymed verſe of eight ſyllables, as,

"Thy rápt ſóul ſitting in thine eyes—"

Or,

"Thro' the high wóod echoing ſhrill.—"

We have, beſides, our doubts, if *firſt* is ſtrongly emphatic in the firſt line of the Paradiſe Loſt; but ſuppoſe it were, and the line ſtood,

"Of man's *firſt* diſobedience and his *laſt*,"

the caſe would be the ſame.

---

* This is equally applicable to verſes in the ſame cadence of ſight and ſix ſyllables.

Though it is anticipating another part of the work, we muſt obſerve here, that a ſtronger example can hardly be given, than from this foot of the power the voice poſſeſſes, of giving the accent to a ſhort ſyllable, and leaving a long ſyllable unaccented. The examples brought by Mr. Mitford of this are *increaſe*, *decreaſe*, (as ſubſtantives,) *heartseaſe*, *colleague*, *ſunriſe*, &c. but as feet, and not words, are the diviſion of verſe, nothing can anſwer the purpoſe better than the proof that can be here produced; to illuſtrate the propoſition more ſtrongly, we will ſubſtitute *forced diſobedience* for *firſt*, and ſuppoſe it requiring a ſtrong emphaſis, as,

"And can forced diſobedience be a crime?"

There can be no doubt of the foot (forced dís) having the accent as we have marked it for all the purpoſes of verſe; and yet in the ſyllable *forced*, the voice is ſtopped by three conſonants, *ſoft c*, *d* pronounced like *t*, and another *d*, with its proper ſound, added to the longeſt poſſible vowel-ſound in our language, viz. the long ſound of *o*, as in g*o*, with the addition of ſhort *u*, exactly as it is pronounced in *firſt*, which we have already ſhewn, is added to all the long vowels before *r*.

To remove every doubt of the impoſſibility of the accent falling on the firſt ſyllable of the ſecond foot, except it is preceded by a ſtrongly marked pauſe, we need only produce the examples from Milton, cited by the author in another place. (P. 218.)

"Open'd into the hill a ſpacious wound."

"Irrecóverably dark total eclipſe."

"That invincible Sampſon far renowned."

Here we do not even find the "diſjecti membra poetæ."

The accent after a pauſe may be transferred from the ſecond to the firſt ſyllable of the third foot, as

"It muſt be ſo; Pláto thou reaſon'ſt well,"

of even of the fourth.

"Thrones and imperial powers, óffspring of Heaven."

But this is from the reaſon before given, viz. that the parts which follow the pauſe are ſhort verſes which admit the aberration of the accent, like

"——— winds that blow
O'er the Elyſian flowers."

Or,

"In health of body, peace of mind,
Quiet by day."

The author mentions alſo the diſpoſition of the pauſe. He obſerves, that

"In every epic verſe there is a critical PAUSE. Far leſs important than either

either accent or quantity, and of ſo quiet and unobtruſive a nature that it remained, till later times, unnoticed, the pauſe is however of conſiderable power toward the general effect of the verſe. Pope, in one of his publiſhed letters, written in early youth, has named, for the proper places of the pauſe, the end of the fourth, fifth, and ſixth ſyllables; and on judiciouſly varying it among theſe ſituations, he has ſaid, much of the merit of verſification depends. But, in maturer age, it appears he found that greater latitude might be allowed. In the third line of the Eſſay on Man the pauſe follows the ſecond ſyllable: in the fourth it is after the ſeventh: in the ſeventh line it occurs again after the ſecond ſyllable; and in the eighth it follows the third. Nor, as we may hereafter ſee, is it confined, by Pope's own practice, or by that of the beſt of our other poets, even to theſe additional ſituations."

This is certainly very juſt, and the pauſe may take place even immediately after the firſt ſyllable or before the laſt, as in Pope's Temple of Fame,

> " Amphion there the loud creating lyre
> Strikes—and behold a ſudden Thebes aſpire."

and in Milton's Paradiſe Loſt,

> " ———Brandiſhing his fatal dart,
> Made to deſtroy, I fled, and cried out—death."

But in both theſe inſtances there is a ſecond pauſe after the fourth ſyllable.

The author now proceeds to give an account of the articulation, orthography, quantity, and accent of the Greek and Latin languages; and he is at ſome pains to confute the generally received opinion, that the ancients had powers of execution and perception with regard to ſpeech, that are unknown to the moderns. On this ſubject we lay the following extract before our readers:

" But a fact, tranſmitted to us on the high authority of Cicero, has been conſidered by ſome as clearly indicating, that the common pronunciation of ancient Rome, as well as that of Greece, was ſtrictly and properly muſical; and, however ſtrange and even ridiculous it may appear to us, that the Roman orators certainly ſpoke from the roſtra to the aſſembled people in regular recitative. For Caius Gracchus, as that greateſt of thoſe orators relates, uſed to be attended in the forum by a ſlave, with a flute or pitch-pipe, whoſe office was to give the tone by which, in addreſſing the multitude, he ſhould modulate his voice. Certainly ſuch an attendant would make an awkward figure, might order allow his appearance, in our houſes of parliament, or courts of juſtice; and the ridicule of the thing could not fail to overbear its uſe. But would it not probably have been ſo alſo in the ſenate-houſe at Rome? Even in the forum the practice appears to have been peculiar to one popular orator; or, at leaſt, not ventured upon by his ſucceſſors in more poliſhed times. Yet, if an orator in the Roman forum, ſurrounded and ſhielded by his partizans, might have recourſe to it, and find it advantageous for preparing his voice to addreſs thronging thouſands in the open air, is it clear that it might not alſo be uſefully adopted by a candidate for popular favour, ſpeaking from a ſcaffold in Palace-yard, or from the huſtings

in Covent-garden? There have indeed been inſtances in the Houſe of Commons, which may be remembered by many, of a fine deep manly voice, which has been univerſally pleaſing, while kept within bounds, but when urged by paſſion to ſtrain for impreſſion, has riſen to what in muſical phraſe might be called a feigned voice, ſqueaking, harſh, and offenſive. Poſſibly thoſe who have obſerved ſuch circumſtances may be inclined to think that, even in the Houſe of Commons, could it be ſo uſed as to be heard only by the orator himſelf and thoſe on the ſame bench, a pitch-pipe might be ſometimes advantageous.

"It can ſcarcely be worth while to notice the ſtory of the Athenian herb-woman and the philoſopher from an Æolian colony, who valued himſelf upon having acquired the fine Attic pronunciation. Is there a cockney, or a weſt-country herb-woman in Covent-garden, who would not at once diſtinguiſh an Iriſh, or a Scottiſh, or a Yorkſhire philoſopher by his accent?"

The truth is, if the pronunciation of the ancient orators was regulated by muſical cadence, and the Greek accents, as many have ſuppoſed were only marks of muſical tones, the nobleſt language that ever exiſted would be deprived of the ſtrongeſt powers of conviction and perſuaſion. What would be the effect of the ſorrows of a Conſtance and a Belvidera, if ſung by the melodious voice of a Billington, inſtead of recited with impaſſioned tones of a Siddons; or what effect would the oratory of a Pitt or a Fox have on the Houſe of Commons, if they delivered their arguments in recitative.

Of the ſtrong effect accent has, independently of quantity, to produce the melody of Latin verſe, Mr. Mitford brings the following convincing and unanſwerable proofs:

"It may be worth while to obſerve how ſcrupulouſly, how importunately, a juſt accentuation of Latin verſe is demanded by our ſcholars: nor may it, for thoſe who have given any attention to the diſputes about accent and quantity, be unamuſing to ſee how widely the accentuation, univerſally demanded, is at variance with the notion that the acute or ſtrong accent is a long quantity, or MAKES a long quantity, or neceſſarily COINCIDES with a long quantity. In Latin hexameter verſe the modern ear requires that the acute or ſtrong accent be confined ſtrictly, in the fifth and ſixth feet, to the firſt ſyllable, and is much diſturbed to find it in any other ſituation. Obſerve the following:

"Æole, namque tibi divum pater atque hominum rex.
Æn. i. 69.

"Exſultantque æſtu latices; furit intus aquæ vis.
vii. 464.

"Conſilium, et ſævæ nutu Junonis eunt res.
vii. 592.

"Quæ vigilanda viris; vel eam ruit imbriferum ver.
Georg. i. 313.

"Theſe, though Virgil wrote them, the modern ear has difficulty to acknowlede for hexameter verſes, on account of the diſlocation (may we call it) of the accent in the fifth and ſixth feet. A modern writer of Latin poetry would hardly dare to offer ſuch. I remember meeting ſomewhere with a criticiſm

criticiſm on Horace's hexameters, in which it was boldly ſaid that a modern ſchoolboy ſhould be whipped for writing verſes of ſuch ſlovenly want of harmony. Yet how different the feelings of the ſame perſons for the ſame antient meaſures in the Sapphic! There the modern ear cannot bear the ſtrong accent on the long ſyllable of the dactyl, where it frequently occurs in Greek verſe, but rigidly requires it on the firſt of the ſhort ſyllables, where, to our great gratification, in Horace we almoſt conſtantly find it. The modern ear will hardly pardon even the numeroſus Horatius an occaſional deviation from this its rule, as in

"Quam jocus circumvolat et cupido."

From ſuch lines as thoſe above quoted from Virgil, and many more ſuch that might be quoted from Horace, too many of our poets are apt to think it is allowable to inſert verſes with a faulty accentuation, to produce ſtriking effect, and ſometimes even for the ſake of variety; of this there are but too many inſtances in Milton. However much a peculiar arrangement of the accents might be agreeable to the ear in Latin verſe, whatever deviation the poet might occaſionally make from that arrangement in particular lines, yet as quantity was the ſole efficient of ancient verſification, while *that* was not violated, the eſſential character of it remained; but an Engliſh verſe, whoſe ſole efficient is accent, ceaſes to be ſo when there is a groſs violation of the allowed rules of accentuation, that being equivalent with a falſe quantity in Greek and Latin. Such a line as,

"Shoots inviſible virtue even to the deep,"

notwithſtanding the authority of Milton, is not only proſe, but very harſh proſe.

It is impoſſible that the accentual cadence, which we generally find in the lines of Virgil, and almoſt always in thoſe of Ovid, as well as in the ſapphics of Horace, can be merely accidental, eſpecially as we have the authority of Quintilian, that our rules of Latin accentuation are correct. But the caſe is widely different in Greek, if we read according to the Greek accentual marks, of whoſe antiquity* and authority Dr. Foſter has removed all doubt, we can find no cadence at all. But before Mr. Mitford proceeds to examine this circumſtance, he inveſtigates the ancient pronunciation of the Greek vowels and conſonants, from what is ſaid on that ſubject in the valuable treatiſe of Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus; and comparing this with the modern Greek pronunciation, he ſhews that the attention is by no means ſo eſſential as has generally been ſuppoſed.

This pronunciation was brought into weſtern Europe by the learned Greeks, who migrated after the downfal of the eaſtern empire, and the capture of Conſtantinople by the Turks, and was adopted by our Univerſities till the celebrated controverſy between Biſhop Gardiner and Sir John Cheke, which is thus related by Mr. Mitford.

---

* Antiquity as to uſe, not as to written character. REVIEWER.

"We

"We learn from that curious collection of letters which paſſed between John Cheke, profeſſor of Greek in the Univerſity of Cambridge, and Stephen Gardiner, biſhop of Wincheſter, and chancellor of the Univerſity, that, to their time, the common pronunciation of the Greek language there, and indeed throughout Europe, as near as foreign voices could retain and tranſmit it, was the ſame which had been taught by the Greeks themſelves, and the ſame nearly as that of the beſt educated of Conſtantinople and Athens at the preſent day. This pronunciation, which Cheke deſired to alter, the Biſhop deſired to preſerve; and it ſeems as if innovation was favoured by the zealous partizans of the Proteſtant cauſe, becauſe it was oppoſed by a Popiſh biſhop; as the correction of the calendar was refuſed throughout Proteſtant Europe, becauſe the truth was firſt brought forward under authority of the ſee of Rome. In the Biſhop's letters we find much dignity, with a juſt politeneſs and moderation in exerting his authority to maintain the eſtabliſhed practice. In the Profeſſor's letters there is conſiderable eloquence, but much petulance, and no ſound argument to recommend the innovation for which he was intemperately earneſt. But the Biſhop's violence in religious matters made him juſtly unpopular; and, with the downfal of Popery, on the acceſſion of Queen Elizabeth, the Profeſſor's cauſe triumphed. Thenceforward, whatever had been preſerved of the articulation, which Grecian voices had taught, was to be denied to the Greek language; and its letters, and combinations of letters, were to have no other ſounds than the cuſtom of Engliſh ſpeech aſſigned to thoſe ſuppoſed the ſame, or equivalent letters in Engliſh orthography."

The confuſion of long and ſhort vowels, occaſioned by introducing our anomalous pronunciation of them in Latin, has been ſhewn in the Italian prieſt's obſervations on the beginning of the Æneid. The ſame confuſion now took place in Greek, and in conſequence of this we vitiate quantity in every verſe we recite, though many boys, who have paſſed through the claſſes of Eton, Weſtminſter, and Wincheſter, can diſtinguiſh the long and ſhort ſyllables by their judgment, or at leaſt by their memory, as well as a Roman or an Athenian.

Still, however, the pronunciation of Greek, according to the accentual marks, was retained and continued in uſe till the middle of the eighteenth century. In a college exerciſe of Prior's, on Exodus iii. 14. *I am that I am*, we find this line,

"And 'Ευρηκα,' your God forſooth is found."

Where the Engliſh verſe require the ſtrong accent to be on the firſt, and the ſecondary accent on the laſt, ſyllable of Ευρηκα, leaving the *eta* unaccented, and changing its quantity to the ſhorteſt vowel-ſound that can form a ſyllable; and Gilbert Weſt, in a note on his tranſlation of Pindar, mentions what he calls reading by quantity, as an improvement juſt introduced at Eton ſchool; we ſay *what he calls* reading by quantity, for we now read Greek according to Latin accent, and though in this mode of reading, as many ſhort ſyllables are accented, and long ſyllables unaccented, as in reading by the accentual marks, yet by following this mode, the ear is pleaſed with nearly the ſame accentual cadence as in Latin verſe, a circumſtance which has

has not been generally conſidered ſo wonderful as it really ſeems to be.

The ſcanning of an Engliſh verſe, if we may uſe the expreſſion, is only an exaggerated pronunciation of the cadence of it; but in ſcanning a Latin verſe, we entirely throw it out of the cadence with which we recite it*, and yet the cadence with which we recite it, and which is ſo very agreeable in the recitation, is produced by the accents properly placed according to the beſt authorities, viz. of Quintilian, and all the ancient grammarians; but that the ſame cadence ſhould be found in reading Greek according to the rules of Latin accentuation, ſeems very ſurpriſing. We have as high authority for the Greek accents being as they are marked, as we have for the rules of Latin accent; and if there had been any eſſential difference between the influence of the accents on the pronunciation of the two languages, it muſt have been noticed by ſome of the writers on the ſubject. Surely, if there had been any material difference in the quantity as well as the ſituation of Greek and Latin accents, Quintilian muſt have mentioned it in this place. "Sed accentus quoque cum rigore quodam tum ſimilitudine ipſa minus ſuaves habemus; (but why?) Quia ultima ſyllaba nec acuta unquam excitatur nec in flexa circumducitur ſed in gravem vel duas graves cadit ſemper. Itaque tanto eſt ſermo Græcus Latino jucundior ut noſtri poetæ quoties dulce carmen eſſe voluerunt illorum id nominibus exornent." QUINT. INST. OR. l. 12. c. 10.

The difficulty, however, attending the proper pronunciation of Greek verſe ſtill appears unſurmountable. To pronounce Greek verſe according to Latin accent, however agreeable to our ears, after ſuch authority, cannot be right. And if we read it according to the accentual marks, it appears to loſe every character of verſe; and who will be bold enough to follow Dr. Warner and Mekerke, and read it as it is ſcanned? To uſe Mr. Mitford's very expreſſive words: "Unfortunately to detect what is out of order in a complex piece of machinery, and to repair it completely and reſtore every motion, are two very different affairs. But between theſe two there are other points, to ſhew what the form of the machine was in its perfect ſtate, and what its motions ſhould be, for which I will not avoid the riſk of offering the beſt help I can."

To follow Mr. Mitford at length, through the means he propoſes for an aproximation to a juſt expreſſion of the harmony of the Greek and Latin languages, would much exceed the bounds of a Review. He ſuppoſes the ἄρσις and the θέσις on the authority of Quintilian and Terentianus, to mean *beating time*; and which ſhall accompany the

---

* The late Dr. Warner publiſhed a treatiſe to recommend the reading of Latin verſe, as it is ſcanned, the only intent of which ſeem to have been to find a vehicle for the conveyance of a number of ſtupidly ſeditious ſentiments.

recitation

recitation of the verſe, marking the metrical cadence. Yet, difficult as this is to the moderns, this difficulty is very much increaſed, by the neceſſity of marking the accents on the proper ſyllable, while the ſtroke indicating the cadence falls on other ſyllables.

"But from the habit of the modern ear to pay deference to accent as the mark of cadence, accent being itſelf the time-beater of modern poetry, a perplexity ariſes, of a moſt teazing kind, till habit may have overcome it. The difficulty has a near analogy to that of the children's trick of tapping with one hand while they rub with the other. Though each action is ſo eaſy by itſelf, with either or with both hands, yet, in firſt attempting the two together, each hand is ſo diſturbed by the contrary motion of the other, as to be unable to effect its own intended motion."

To put this in practice, we confeſs ourſelves quite unequal; but if it really be as Mr. Mitford ſuppoſes, ancient poetry muſt have been much more allied to muſic than modern poetry; it muſt have been impoſſible either to compoſe or recite ancient verſe without having a good muſical ear, which is ſo far from being the caſe with regard to modern, or at leaſt Engliſh, verſe, that Pope, the melody of whoſe verſe is proverbial, is known to have had no ear for muſic; and perſons who ſing well ſeldom recite well; and a gentleman well known, whoſe powers of reciting verſe are ſuperior to any we have ever witneſſed, is not able to hum the commoneſt tune.

From all we can collect on the ſubject, it does appear that ancient verſe approached nearer to the cadence of ſinging than that of ours does. We find the term of ſinging applied, not to lyric poetry only, but to epopee alſo, as appears from the firſt line both of the Iliad and the Æneid; and which we have very improperly adopted in our narrative poetry. As the union, therefore, of poetry and muſic was much cloſer among the ancients, may we not reaſonably ſuppoſe that they met half way? that their verſe was more congenial with muſical melody, and their muſical melody more regulated by metrical and accentual cadence than ours.

Even in our own muſic Mr. Mitford juſtly obſerves, that verſe of the heroic or dramatic cadence, where accent falls on every other ſyllable, and which thoſe who are fond of calling modern things by ancient names, term Iambic agrees beſt with common tune, while our other meaſure, where the accent falls on every third ſyllable, and which is ſometimes called anapæſtic, coincides beſt with triple time, and this coincidence is generally found in our oldeſt and moſt ſimple ſongs; and, to quote the words of the author, "the oldeſt literary compoſitions among all nations are found to be ſongs, in which a meaſured flow of language has been accompanied by a ſimilarly meaſured muſical melody. Proſe is adverſe to connection with muſic; and if in modern times proſe has been ſet to muſic by Handel with the higheſt ſucceſs, it has been through ingenious uſe of the modern licence to aſſign any length of note, and any number of notes, to any ſyllable."

Mr.

Mr. Mitford proceeds now to examine the verſification of the Spaniſh, Italian, French, and modern Greek, which he clearly proves to be accentual, except the French, which has no accent, and depends entirely on the number of ſyllables, the rhyme, and the pauſe, he then adverts to the effect of the Scottiſh accent on the pronunciation of Engliſh, and gives the following ludicrous account of what happened in conſequence of it in one of our legiſlative aſſemblies:

"A Scottiſh member, more remarkable for a powerful eloquence, than for pure Engliſh pronunciation, in the courſe of a ſpeech ſaid, 'I will not give my ſupport to a cabal; I will give my ſupport to adminiſtration.' This declaration, the part he meant to take having been before dubious, produced a marked ſenſation, with a cry of 'hear, hear,' which excited the curioſity of a member juſt then entering. Turning to old Pearſon the door-keeper, who happened to be at his elbow, within the door, he aſked what the ſpeaking member had ſaid? 'I do not know,' anſwered Pearſon, 'what he has been talking about; only I juſt heard him ſay he would give a ball and a ſupper to adminiſtration.' This ſtrange perverſion of the words, as jocular as it may appear, the old man made without any purpoſe of either joke or perverſion; miſled entirely by the learned member's Scottiſh pronunciation of the words *cabal* and *ſupport*, with a long vowel in the ſecond ſyllable of the former, as in the words *ball* and *bawl*, and the ſtrong accent on the firſt ſyllable of the latter, as in the word *ſupper*."

To give our general opinion of the work, we do not heſitate to ſay that among the many treatiſes that have been written, and the hypotheſes that have been formed on this complicated ſubject, we have never read one where it has been treated ſo clearly and ſo naturally; and if it does not in every inſtance bring entire conviction to us, in moſt caſes we are forced to aſſent to the argument of the author, unleſs we can believe that the eye, and not the ear, is the proper judge of the pronunciation of language.

The ſtyle is in general ſimple and elegant, and to bring forth trivial defects in a work of this kind would be hypercritical. But to the following etymology of the word *poetry* in a note we cannot aſſent: "Poetry, Ποιητικὴ, means a made and ſtudied arrangement, a manufacture of words; Proſe, Πεζὴ Λέξις, a walking diſcourſe, as if in oppoſition to the meaſured and ſtudied movements of dance." For Ariſtotle expreſsly ſays, and we muſt allow him in this caſe to be a competent judge, that the character of poet is rather derived from the compoſition of the fable than the verſe. Ποιητικὴ, therefore, does not mean a made and ſtudied arrangement, a manufacture of words; but the creative faculty of the poet or *maker*, ſhewn in the manufacture and arrangement of the circumſtances of his fable, and to all writers of didactic verſe, the ſagyrite refuſes the appellation of poet.

Remarks

Remarks on Dr. Kipling, and Reply to the Remarks.

(Concluded from p. 19.)

TO the luminous aſſertion of Univerſal Redemption in our XXXIſt Article, Dr. Kipling oppoſes the following expreſſions of Calvin: in a morte æternâ non multos eripit—inundum in ſuo interitu, cui deſtinatus eſt, relinquit." (Inſt. III. 22-7.) "Pauci ergo electi ſunt ex magno vocatorum numero." (Inſt. III. 24-8. Theſe are only a ſmall ſpecimen of the innumerable paſſages in which Calvin confines the efficacy of our Saviour's ſatisfaction to a very ſmall number of the human race. Of the former quotation Academicus gives only the firſt ſix words, ſuppreſſing the others, on which the whole weight of the Dean's argument is founded. What he gives, he ſays, however, "appears to him perfectly conſiſtent with the Article. For though it is true that Chriſt's death is a perfect propitiation for all the ſins of the whole world, does it follow that all, or even the greater part, are actually ſaved from eternal death, or that any are ſaved except believers?" (P. 16.) We muſt here take the liberty bluntly to obſerve, that Academicus is guilty at once of prevarication, and of intentionally ſhifting the queſtion. Academicus under an ambiguous expreſſion, means only what a candid Calviniſt would have ſaid, *that the death of Chriſt was of value ſufficient to have been a propitiation, if God had ſo pleaſed, for the ſins of the whole world.* The inquiry which he ſtarts is nothing to the purpoſe. For the point in diſpute is not whether few or many ſhall be ſaved, and whether any ſhall be ſaved except believers; but whether all have it in their power to be ſaved, or whether all are redeemed in ſuch a ſenſe as that their actual ſalvation depends upon themſelves. Academicus dares not acknowledge that they are.

With regard to the ſecond of the above quotations, Academicus aſks, "Was not the Dean aware that theſe are the very words of Chriſt. 'Many are called, but few choſen.' Yet he thinks them repugnant to our XXXIſt Article." (Ibid.) This, as we have already ſeen, is a favourite mode of reaſoning with our author; who, when he finds that he can do nothing better, takes for granted the very point in debate. We, therefore, anſwer him in the words of Academicus junior, which will always be a proper reply to this argument, whenſoever, and by whomſoever it is advanced.

"Unleſs Jeſus thought, as Calvin did, that his heavenly Father elected, before the world began, only a few individuals, and thoſe abſolutely, unconditionally, and without any reſpect whatever to their behaviour in this life, moſt aſſuredly, Sir, he and Calvin ſpoke of elections, in thoſe two paſſages, totally diſtinct from one another. My friend, you know, like almoſt all our commentators, *denies* that our bleſſed Saviour ever did utter ſuch a ſentiment as this of Calvin. Wherefore, although the Dean has oppoſed to the XXXIſt Article of our church the above inference of Calvin, it does *not* follow that he has thereby oppoſed to it the above ſaying of Chriſt. Yet to prove that this *does* follow is the whole driſt of your remark." (Rep. Pp. 70, 71.)

"It

"It is peculiarly unfortunate," says Academicus, "for the Dean, that he cannot prove this article Anti-Calviniſtic any other way than by aſſerting that it is unſcriptural." (P. 16.) If he cannot, he is indeed peculiarly unfortunate; for he certainly has made no ſuch aſſertion; and he has likewiſe *attempted* ſuch proof in a way very different. His argument is this. According to Calvin, the whole human race became, by Adam's fall, a maſs of corrupted and vitiated creatures. On account of this corruption and depravity, every deſcendant of Adam became a loſt, accurſed, and condemned being. From this dreadful ſtate the elect are delivered; but the reprobates, that is, the bulk of mankind, are left in it. "Deus mundum in interitu ſuo, cui deſtinatus eſt, relinquit." On theſe reprobates, therefore, the damning effects of ORIGINAL SIN "abide for ever;" ſo that, if Calviniſm be true, the greater part of the human race neither does, nor can, receive any benefit from the death of Chriſt. But our XXXIſt Article affirms that "the offering of Chriſt once made is a perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction for ALL the ſins of the WHOLE WORLD; both ORIGINAL and ACTUAL." The concluſion is obvious. This article we formerly pronounced to be *crux Calviniſtarum* (Anti-Jac. xv. 13.), and our author's feeble efforts to reconcile it with his ſcheme confirm us in our own opinion. On Dr. K.'s argument we are not ſurprized that he has made no remarks; for it is, in truth, invulnerable.

"That Calvin," he proceeds, "was not diſpoſed to derogate from the efficacy of the atonement, may be inferred from his comment on the words of the Baptiſt, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the ſin of the world.' 'Nunc vero quod omnibus offertur beneficium, amplecti noſtrum eſt: ut ſtatuant ſinguli, nihil ſibi obſtare, quo minus reconciliationem in Chriſto obtineant, ſi modo, duce fide, ad ipſum accedant." (P. 17.) Of all the paſſages in Academicus's pamphlet this is, perhaps, the moſt diſingenuous, ſophiſtical, and artful. Obſerve his circumſpection in employing language directly calculated to impoſe on the reader. "Calvin was not diſpoſed to derogate from the *efficacy* of the atonement!" Who ſays that he was? He held it, we know, to be perfectly efficacious for the ſalvation of his elect; but the queſtion is, Did he limit its extent? If Academicus had intended to ſay any thing to the purpoſe, or to deal fairly by his readers, he muſt have affirmed that ſuch limitation was no eſſential part of Calvin's ſyſtem. But plainly to have made ſuch an affirmation was too much even for Academicus; though he evidently wiſhes his words to be ſo conſtrued. Unfortunately, however, this very comment is, as Dr. Kipling's friend obſerves, "an inſuperable proof that Calvin *did* limit the efficacy of Chriſt's atonement in extent, and limit it in a prodigious degree. The words '*ſi modo, duce fide, ad ipſum accedant*,' ſhew moſt evidently that, in Calvin's opinion, no perſon whatever can partake of the benefit which is denominated by him 'reconciliation in Chriſt,' who is not under the guidance and conduct of faith. But that the reprobates of Calvin neither are, nor are permitted to be, under

der this guidance, is manifeſt from numberleſs paſſages in his Inſtitutes." (Rep. p. 75.) Of theſe paſſages the author of the reply contents himſelf with quoting two, which are full to the purpoſe; but as we have already given them, in the former part of our ſtrictures, we ſhall not repeat them. It may be proper, however, to point them out, that our readers may be enabled to judge of their force. They are the *firſt* and *fourth* of the five quotations with which the firſt part of our remarks are concluded. Indeed all the five bear directly on the point; and we ſhall now call the attention of our learned readers to the 16th Sect. of the 24th Chap. of the 3d Book of the Inſtitutes, which is *inſtar omnium*, and ſets the notions of Calvin on this ſubject in the cleareſt light.

Calvin had taken much pains, in the preceding part of the chapter, to prove that none but the elect are capable of ſalvation. In the 16th ſection he comes to anſwer an objection, which was urged againſt his doctrine from the general nature of the promiſes of God. In order that his ſentiments may be fully ſeen, it is neceſſary to copy his words at length; but the high importance of the extract muſt plead our excuſe

"Sed enim (inquies) ſi ita eſt, parum erit fidei promiſſionibus Evangelicis, quæ, quum de voluntate Dei teſtantur, eum velle aſſerunt quod inviolabili ejus decreto adverſetur. Minime vero. Quamlibet enim univerſales ſint ſalutis promiſſiones, nihil tamen a reproborum prædeſtinatione diſcrepant; *modo in earum effectum mentem dirigamus.* Efficaces nobis tum demum eſſe promiſſiones ſcimus, *ubi eas fide recipimus*; ubi contra exinanita eſt fides, ſimul abolita eſt promiſſio. Ea ſi eſt natura ipſarum, videamus jam nunquid inter ſe hæc diſſideant, quod dicitur ab æterno Deus ordinaſſe quos amore complecti, in quos iram exercere velit, et quod ſalutem omnibus indiſcriminatom denunciat. *Equidem dico optime convenire*; ſic enim promittendi, nihil aliud vult, quam omnibus expoſitam eſſe ſuam miſericordiam, qui *modo eam expetunt atque implorant!* QUOD NON ALII FACIUNT NISI QUOS ILLUMINAVIT. PORRO ILLUMINAT QUOS PRÆDESTINAVIT IN SALUTEM. His (inquam) conſtat certa et inconcuſſa promiſſionum veritas, ut dici nequeat aliquid eſſe diſſenſionis inter æternam Dei electionem, et quod fidelibus offert gratiæ ſuæ teſtimonium. *Sed cur omnes nominat?* Nempe quo tutius piorum conſcientiæ acquieſcant, dum intelligunt nullam eſſe peccatorum differentiam, *modo adsit fides:* impii autem non cauſentur ſibi deeſſe aſylum quo ſe a peccati ſervitute recipiant, dum oblatum ſibi ingratitudine ſuâ reſpuunt. Ergo quum utriſque Dei miſericordia per Evangelium offeratur; *fides est, hoc est,* DEI ILLUMINATIO, *quæ inter pios, et impios distinguit, ut Evangelii efficaciam illi sentiant, hi vero nullum inde fructum consequantur.* ILLUMINATIO QUOQUE IPSA ELECTIONEM DEI ÆTERNAM PRO REGULA HABET."

This paſſage is, unqueſtionably, a virtual confeſſion, on the part of Calvin, that, according to his ſyſtem of theology, the whole conduct of God, in the diſpenſation of grace, is an impoſition on his creatures. It is alſo a moſt deciſive proof that the above quoted paſſage from Calvin's commentary on St. John is directly againſt the purpoſe for which Academicus produced it. We obſerve that it has likewiſe been produced

duced by an author who is never to be mentioned without profound reſpect (See Daubeny's Vindiciæ, p. 457.) as "a ſtriking proof of Calvin's fallibility, or contradiction of himſelf." But the extended extract here given from the Inſtitutes demonſtrates it to be perfectly conſiſtent with his general principles.

"The Dean," purſues Academicus, "endeavours to prove that, without reprobation, the doctrine of election cannot ſtand." (P. 17.) So, at leaſt, thought Calvin, who muſt certainly be allowed to have ſtudied the ſubject, though ſome of his refractory diſciples pretend to diſpute his authority. "Ac multi quidem, ac ſi invidiam a Deo repellere vellent, electionem ita fatentur ut negent quenquam reprobari; ſed inſcite nimis et pueriliter: *quando ipſa electio, niſi reprobationi oppoſita, non ſtaret.*" (Inſt. III. 23. 1.) But "the Dean endeavours *to prove* this." *Endeavours!* The Dean *has* proved it, by an argument which all the logic of Academicus will not confute. This argument our readers will find in Anti-Jac. Rev. Vol. XVI. p. 60. Academicus has certainly ſhewn his wiſdom by declining the attempt; but he grievouſly complains of the Dean's concluſion, that whoever believes one of theſe two doctrines cannot diſbelieve the other. In the whining cant of conſcious impotence, he tells us, that "to affirm that every man muſt diſcern the conſequences of every doctrine [which] he maintains, is unreaſonable;" and that "it is no leſs uncandid to charge any one with holding opinions which he expreſsly diſavows." (P. 17.) It is obvious, however, that all this muſt be admitted with ſome limitations. If the conſequences of a principle are fairly ſhewn to be, at once, untenable and unavoidable, the principle itſelf will inſtantly be renounced by every honeſt man. Yet ſome men, of great abilities too, have been known to reſiſt even mathematical demonſtration. Let our Calviniſts prove, inſtead of aſſerting, that Calviniſtic election has no neceſſary connection with Calviniſtic reprobation, and that connection ſhall no longer be urged againſt them. Nay, let them only point out the fallacy of Dr. Kipling's argument, and it ſhall be allowed that, on this ground at leaſt, the victory is their own.

The Remarker cenſures his friend, Mr. Overton, whom yet he compliments as "a valuable writer," and whom "he is inclined to place in the number of judicious Calviniſts," (p. 18.) for talking looſely and obſcurely about "abſolute decrees, abſolute reprobation," &c. "The obſcurity," he ſays, "ariſes from the ambiguous ſenſe of the word *abſolute.*" (P. 17.) He then kindly explains to us ſome of the ſenſes in which it is taken. "Sometimes, by 'abſolute decrees' are underſtood decrees founded upon the ſovereign will of God, independently of any foreſeen merit or demerit in the objects to which they relate. In this ſenſe," he adds, "I conceive that Mr. Overton does not diſavow abſolute decrees." (P. 18.) In what ſenſe Mr. Overton diſavows them we ſhall not take upon us to determine; though we ſtrongly ſuſpect that his diſavowal of them in any ſenſe was intended merely to avoid the odium of an ugly word, which, both in divinity and in poli-

tics, has, for a very conſiderable period, been, in this kingdom, extremely unpopular. If, however, he meant to be underſtood as diſclaiming Calvin's notion of decrees, his aſſertion, we think, will not obtain much credit; for his whole book, from beginning to end, is directly in oppoſition to it. "But from the manner," ſays our author, "in which abſolute decrees are frequently explained, it would follow that one claſs of men may repent, believe, and obey; and yet periſh, becauſe they are not elected: while others may live impenitent, unbelieving, and diſobedient, and nevertheleſs be ſaved; becauſe they are of the number of the elect." If thoſe who thus explain abſolute decrees apply their explanation to Calvin's decrees, it is evident that they either expreſs themſelves inaccurately, or do not comprehend his ſyſtem. For Calvin, we have ſeen, is perfectly conſiſtent. According to him, thoſe who are not elected can never repent, believe, and obey; while thoſe who are, can never live impenitent, unbelieving, and diſobedient. Laſtly, "Abſolute decrees are ſometimes explained," our author ſays, "as if they were arbitrary, and not founded in perfect wiſdom and holineſs." In the two laſt ſenſes, he avers, they are diſclaimed by Mr. Overton and all judicious Calviniſts. If we underſtand Academicus rightly, he does not diſclaim Calvin's decrees: he muſt therefore think theſe decrees not arbitrary, but founded in perfect *wiſdom* and *holineſs*. We wonder that he did not add *juſtice*, *veracity*, and *mercy*. It would, indeed, we think be doing his cauſe eſſential ſervice to ſhew how perfectly and plainly decrees, the like to which would render a *human being* to all future ages infamous and execrable, are in harmony with every moral attribute of GOD; and we, therefore, adviſe him to undertake it. It is an exerciſe on which all his ingenuity may be employed. In attempting it, Calvin himſelf, it is true, has egregiouſly failed; but Academicus, we doubt not, may be more ſucceſsful.

We are now arrived at the 3d Chapter of the Remarks, which conſiders the arguments urged by Dr. Kipling, from the liturgy of our church, with a view to ſhew that ſhe is not Calviniſtic. The firſt of theſe is derived from the declaration in the abſolution, that "Almighty God deſireth not the death of a ſinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedneſs and live." To this declaration "the Dean oppoſes," ſays our author, "theſe words of Calvin, 'impios deſtinato creatos ut perirent: which the Dean underſtands as if the ultimate end for which they were created was their damnation; a notion not maintained by Calvin." (P. 19) The Dean, however, has oppoſed to the words in the abſolution no fewer than ten extracts from Calvin, every one of them a libel on Almighty God, and in total oppoſition to the declaration of our Church. But what can Academicus mean by ſaying that the notion juſt mentioned is not maintained by Calvin? Can that notion be more diſtinctly expreſſed than in the very words which he himſelf has quoted, and of which the literal tranſlation is, "The wicked are *deſignedly* created for perdition?" Perhaps he intends only to affirm that the *ultimate* end for which the reprobate were created was not to

be

be damned, but *by their damnation to glorify God.* For this he has certainly the authority of Calvin. "Naſcuntur ab utero certæ morti devoti *qui ſuo exitio ipſius nomen glorificent.* (Inſt. III. 23. 6.) Suſcitati ſunt *ad gloriam ejus ſuâ damnatione illustrandam.*" (III. 24. 14.) Calvin, ſpeaking of the fall of man, ſays, "Lapſus eſt primus homo, quia Dominus ita expedire cenſuerat: cur cenſuerit nos latet. Certum tamen eſt non aliter cenſuiſſe, niſi quia videbat *nominis ſui gloriam inde merito illustrari.* (III. 23 8.) He adds, with ſovereign effrontery, and contempt of truth, "Ubi mentionem gloriæ Dei audis *illic juſtitiam cogita*;" in which ſentiment he is faithfully followed by the compilers of the Weſtminſter Confeſſion of Faith, who ſay that "the reſt of mankind God was pleaſed to paſs by, and to ordain them to diſhonour and wrath—TO THE PRAISE OF HIS GLORIOUS JUSTICE." (Cap. iii. Sec. 7.) If Academicus thinks that this notable diſtinction can at all contribute to the defence of his ſyſtem, we ſhould be ſorry to deprive him of any advantage which may be derived from it.

But our author, with a view to ſhew that the abſolution is not inconſiſtent with Calvin's reprobation, aſks, "May not God, for wiſe and good ends though to us perhaps inſcrutable, ordain events which, in their own nature, are not pleaſing to him?" (P. 19.) This, however, is merely to deceive his readers: for by Calvin no end of reprobation is either ſuppoſed or admitted but the ſovereign and incontroulable pleaſure of God. "Neque etiam in aliis reprobandis aliud habemus quam ejus voluntatem." (Inſt. III. 22. 11.) Academicus illuſtrates the ſubject by the caſe of a commander who employs a detachment of his army on a ſervice which he foreſees will be attended with their inevitable deſtruction. "He may be juſtified by the end which he has in view." And "no one," our author ſays, "would charge him with inſincerity, for expreſſing his regret or exclaiming, I deſire not their deſtruction, but rather that they might be ſaved." (P. 19) When our Calviniſts are obliged to have recourſe to ſuch reaſoning, they muſt be ſorely preſſed: for we have too good an opinion of our author's ſagacity to believe, for a moment, that he did not perceive the glaring fallacy of his illuſtration. To make the caſes at all parallel, the commander muſt have *previouſly determined* to ſacrifice a part of his troops, and that for no other end but to gratify his own cruelty and caprice. He muſt likewiſe be imagined to have not only the motions of his "forlorn hope," but thoſe of the enemy alſo, in his power; and to have expreſsly contrived and arranged ſuch a train of circumſtances that his deſtined victims cannot poſſibly eſcape. Suppoſing all this, without which our author's ſimile is nothing to the point, what character would ſuch a commander deſerve, if he ſtill exclaimed, as Academicus would make him, "I deſire not the deſtruction of theſe men, but rather that they might be ſaved?"

Againſt his illuſtration, "a plauſible objection," our Remarker ſays, "may be advanced. What reſemblance can be found between the caſe of a commander who ſacrifices part of his army for the preſervation of the whole, and the Calviniſtic ſyſtem, which repreſents the

Supreme Being as devoting the great maſs of mankind to certain perdition, in order to bring a few ſons to glory." And he allows that the objection would be concluſive, "if the fact aſſumed in it were true; that the ſole or principal end of the damnation of the reprobate is the ſalvation of the elect. But," adds he, "although it may probably be one of the ends deſigned by infinite wiſdom, we have no authority to call it the ultimate end." (P. 20.) We are ſomewhat at a loſs what to make of this paſſage. The objection, we conceive, is of our author's own ſtarting; for we do not recollect to have ſeen it before. It is certain, indeed, that a general's ſacrificing a part of his army for the preſervation of the remainder (to ſacrifice a *part* for the preſervation of the *whole* would be rather extraordinary) bears no analogy to Calvin's predeſtination, unleſs the damnation of the reprobate be *abſolutely neceſſary* to the ſalvation of the elect; but we know not by whom this opinion is maintained: nor do we ſee on what grounds it can be adopted. Academicus ſays that the ſalvation of the elect is probably one of the ends deſigned by the damnation of the reprobate. We wiſh that he had told us on what this concluſion is founded. He does not, however, think the ſalvation of the elect the ultimate end of the damnation of the reprobate; and indeed, conſiſtently with Calvin, he cannot: for, according to Calvin, that end is either *the ſovereign will*, or *the glory* of God. But our author reminds us that we cannot be ſure what influence the diſpenſations of God to man may have on beings in other worlds. In this we fully agree with Academicus: and have always regarded it as a weighty conſideration. But if we, like him, were Calviniſts, it would yield us no ſatisfaction. That innumerable moral beings in a ſtate of probation may poſſibly be warned and preſerved in innocence by the fate of wicked men is extremely probable. And this reflection ſufficiently vindicates the puniſhment of incorrigible offenders who had it in their power to have acted otherwiſe. But the miſery of wretches, not only foredoomed, by an arbitrary decree, to eternal torments, but ſedulouſly and ſyſtematically prepared to be fit victims of wrath, can, according to human notions at leaſt, produce no good effects in other ſyſtems, nor, to ſay the truth, ſerve any purpoſe except to exhibit the Creator of the univerſe, in the eyes of all his rational creatures, as a mercileſs, cruel, and capricious tyrant. So truly blaſphemous is the ſyſtem of Calvin!

Academicus proceeds to Dr. Kipling's argument from the prayer of St. Chryſoſtom. The words on which the argument is built are theſe: "granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlaſting." This prayer, the Dean contends, cannot be deſigned for either Calvin's reprobates or elect, becauſe a reprobate cannot, by prayer, obtain everlaſting life, nor an elect, by neglecting prayer, loſe it. But, "if it is decreed that I ſhall be ſaved, does it follow," aſks our author, "that I may be ſaved without prayer? *May not the means be neceſſary for the end, and equally predeſtined?*" (P. 22.) Our readers will obſerve that this is an evaſion, and not a ſolution

lution of the Dean's objection. If the means are predeſtined, as Calvin contends, they will take place without our giving ourſelves any trouble about them. We do not remember that Calvin has determined that it is impoſſible for the reprobate to pray; but we are ſure that he holds their prayers to be of no efficacy. "This prophane apology for ſin," however, our Remarker alleges, "may, with as much *appearance* of reaſon, and with as little truth, be founded upon God's foreknowledge, as upon his decree. If he foreknows that I ſhall be ſaved, the event is certain, and therefore the uſe of means unneceſſary." (Ib.) But the caſes are altogether different. God may foreknow that I ſhall be ſaved, though my ſalvation may depend on my own proper choice to uſe or neglect the means, which, according to Calvin's divinity, it is not. He may have decreed that all who perform certain conditions ſhall be ſaved; and he may foreknow that I ſhall perform ſuch conditions. But Calviniſts reject all conditional decrees, and all power in man to perform any conditions. Yet it is curious to ſee Academicus urging, againſt what he calls the "ſophiſtry" of Dr. K's. reaſoning, two paſſages of Scripture (Acts xxiii. and xxvii.) relative to the conduct of St. Paul, which invincibly eſtabliſh the Doctor's ſentiments, and as invincibly ſubvert his own. When St. Paul was in priſon, "the Lord ſtood by him, and ſaid, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou haſt teſtified of me in Jeruſalem, ſo muſt thou bear witneſs alſo at Rome." Yet we find the apoſtle, notwithſtanding this aſſurance, taking proper precautions to defeat a conſpiracy againſt his life. It was revealed to him that not a man on board the ſhip in which he was ſhould periſh. Yet he tells the centurion and the ſoldiers, "Except theſe abide in the ſhip, ye cannot be ſaved." Will it be ſaid that, without the precautions recorded, the life of St. Paul in the one caſe, in the other, that of St. Paul and of the crew, would have been preſerved, or that the parties concerned had no diſcretionary power to obſerve or to neglect theſe precautions? If neither can be ſaid, what can be more evident than that, according to Scripture, the decrees of God are ſuſpended on conditions, which men may, or may not, perform as they pleaſe.

In the Collect for the 4th Sunday after Trinity, we pray that "we may ſo paſs through things temporal, that we finally loſe not the things eternal." "But theſe things eternal," ſay Dr. K. "the elect of Calvin cannot loſe, and his reprobates can never poſſeſs." Hence he concludes that this prayer is Anti-Calviniſtic. "But it is," ſays Academicus, "perfectly conſiſtent with Calvin's doctrine. For though the elect cannot loſe the inheritance which is 'reſerved in heaven for them,' it is only becauſe they are kept by the power of God, through faith, unto ſalvation. Therefore that they may not finally loſe the things eternal, they implore his almighty aid." (P. 23.) Here the doctrines of invincible grace and final perſeverance are directly aſſerted. Calviniſm cannot ſubſiſt without making man a mere machine. The good works of the elect are, in no ſenſe their

own, but wholly and ſolely the works of God. Still the queſtion recurs, and ever muſt recur, why pray for that which they cannot loſe?

From the words in the Litany, "From everlaſting damnation, good Lord, deliver us," Dr. K. draws an argument ſimilar to the foregoing, and Academicus makes a ſimilar reply. He repeats again the univerſal ſolution of every difficulty, as far as theſe difficulties concern the elect, "that the means are neceſſary to the end, and equally predeſtined." (P. 23.) With regard to the reprobate, "the abſurdity," he ſays, "of ſuch a prayer in their mouths turns upon the unwarrantable ſuppoſition that they know themſelves to be ſuch." It might here be aſked, how, on Calvin's principles, ſuch a ſuppoſition is unwarrantable? If, by the ſpecial illuminations of the Spirit of God, the elect may, and do, know themſelves to be the elect, why may not the reprobate, by the want of ſuch illuminations, know themſelves to be reprobates? But whether the ſuppoſition be warrantable or not, it is utterly falſe that the abſurdity of ſuch a prayer in the mouth of a reprobate turns on it. The abſurdity is founded on that eſſential principle of Calvin's ſyſtem; that, in the mouth of a reprobate, all prayer is uſeleſs.

To the Dean's obſervation, that, at leaſt every one knows, according to Calvin, that he is either elect or reprobate, however uncertain he may be to which of theſe claſſes he belongs, Academicus anſwers, "Granted: muſt he, therefore do nothing? No: he would rather infer, If I am doomed to perdition, prayer can hardly make my condition worſe. If I am ordained to life, I know it muſt be in the way of holineſs; therefore I will not neglect prayer, and the other means of grace." (Pp. 23, 24.)

No eloquence could paint, in more lively colours, the ridiculous complection of Calvin's theological ſyſtem, than this plain and ſimple language of Academicus. Suppoſing a man to be a firm believer in Calvin's doctrine of predeſtination, he could never adopt this writer's reaſoning without abandoning the principles of common ſenſe. Without all controverſy, the true and right argument, on theſe principles is this, "If I am doomed to perdition, prayer cannot make my condition better. But, if I am ordained to life, I know that prayer and the other means of grace *muſt* follow, for the means are equally predeſtined with the end." It may be worth our while to ſee how Calvin himſelf gets over this very ſame objection.

"Hoc quoque," he ſays, "ad evertendam prædeſtinationem exagitant, quod, ipſâ ſtante, concidat omnis ſolicitudo, et bene agendi ſtudium. Quis enim audiat, inquiunt, æterno et immutabili Dei decreto ſibi fixam eſſe aut vitam aut mortem, quin protinus in mentem veniat; nihil intereſſe quomodo ſe gerat: quando ſuo opere nihil impediri aut promoveri queat Dei prædeſtinatio? Ita omnes projicient ſe, et deploratum in morem, quocunque libido tulerit, præcipites ibunt. Et ſane non univerſum mentiuntur. Sunt enim plerique, porci, qui prædeſtinationis doctrinam impuris iſtis blaſphemiis conſpurcant, atque hoc etiam obtentu admonitiones et objurgationes quaſlibet eludunt, Scit Deus quid de nobis agere ſemel ſtatuerit. *Si ſalutem* decrevit, adducet nos ad eam ſuo tempore: ſi mortem deſtinavit, fruſtra contra tenderemus!"

To this "fœdus porcorum grunnitus," as he calls it, he anſwers: "Si electionis ſcopus eſt vitæ ſanctimonia, magis ad eam alacriter meditandam expergefacere et ſtimulare nos debet, quam ad deſidiæ prætextum valere. Quantopere enim hæc inter ſe diſſident, a bene agendo ceſſare, quia electio ad ſalutem ſufficiat, et electioni propoſitum eſſe finem ut in bonorum ſtudium incumbamus? Faceſſant ergo ejuſmodi ſacrilegii, quæ totum electionis ordinem perperam invertunt. *Quod autem blaſphemias longius extendunt, dum eum qui sit a Deo reprobatus, perditurum operam dicunt, si innocentiâ et probitate vitæ se illi approbare studeat; in eo vero impudentissimi mendacii convincuntur.* UNDE ENIM TALE STUDIUM ORIRI POSSIT, NISI EX ELECTIONE? *Nam quicunque sunt ex reproborum numero,* UT SUNT VASA IN CONTUMELIAM FORMATA, *ita non desinunt perpetuis flagitiis iram Dei in se provocare, et evidentibus signis* CONFIRMARE QUOD JAM IN SE LATUM EST DEI JUDICIUM: TANTUM ABEST UT CUM IPSO FRUSTRA CONTENDANT." (Inſt. III. 23. 12.)

Our readers, we think, muſt admire the ingenuity diſplayed in this paſſage; which, while it pretends to remove a moſt formidable, and, indeed, an inſurmountable objection, concludes by leaving the objection itſelf in its utmoſt force, and not only admits, but boldly inculcates the very principle on which it is founded. The whole import of the anſwer, they will obſerve, is this: That the reprobate are neceſſitated, by God's decree, to co-operate with him in bringing about their own damnation.

On reviewing Dr. K's. pamphlet, we ſaid: "Mathematical demonſtration itſelf is not clearer than that on Calvin's principles of predeſtination, all prayer, for ſpiritual bleſſings at leaſt, is abſurd and ridiculous." (Vol. XVI. p. 62.) With what propriety, for inſtance, can the petition in the benediction, "The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt," &c. be offered up for a congregation of which, according to Calvin, four fifths are probably reprobates? Academicus anſwers in the words of Auguſtine, "Quia neſcimus quis ad prædeſtinatorum numerum pertineat, vel non pertineat, ſic nos affici debet, ut omnes velimus ſalvos fieri." But this is, in reality, no anſwer at all: for, though, in any congregration, we do not know what individuals are reprobates, we are perfectly certain that, if any ſuch there be, our prayers can be of no advantage to them. According to Calvin's principles, therefore, the benediction ſhould run thus: "The grace of our Lord, &c. be with all of us who are not reprobates." Yet even then the petition would be nonſenſe, becauſe, as we muſt ever repeat, why ſhould men pray for what they cannot loſe? So demonſtrable is it, that, on Calvin's principles, prayer, in whatever light conſidered, is abſolutely abſurd.

But, repeats Academicus, if there be any force in the foregoing argument, it will apply equally againſt God's preſcience as againſt his decrees. "With what propriety can this ſame petition be offered up, univerſally, for a congregation, in which, probably, there are many individuals concerning whom God foreſees that they will be finally impenitent?" (P. 24.) This, however, is mere ſophiſtry. The propriety and reaſonableneſs of prayer depend, in no degree, on

God's foreſeeing who ſhall be happy and miſerable at laſt, but on the ſuppoſition that men are free moral agents, who, with the promiſed aſſiſtance of divine grace to thoſe who aſk it, have it in their power to repent and be ſaved. Every individual muſt neceſſarily die either penitent or impenitent. Which of the two ſhall, in any particular caſe, be the event, God may foreſee, and man may, in many inſtances, conjecture. But neither God's foreknowledge, nor man's conjectures, is the cauſe of the events taking place. This circumſtance totally deſtroys the analogy which Academicus would eſtabliſh between predeſtination and preſcience. If man himſelf be the cauſe of his deſtiny, prayer is reaſonable even for thoſe whom God foreſees that they will die impenitent. But to pray that thoſe may repent and be ſaved whom God has irrevocably decreed to be damned, is equally abſurd and impious. Suppoſing repentance in every man's power, if the finally impenitent had choſen to repent, their repentance would have been foreſeen by God: but God cannot foreſee that thoſe will repent, whom he has determined to exclude from repentance.

In the Collects for Aſh-Wedneſday and Good-Friday, God is ſaid "to hate nothing that he has made." Calvin ſays, "reprobos Deo *exoſos* eſſe." (Inſt. III. 24. 16.) But, argues our author, "there is the ſame *apparent* contradiction between our Liturgy and theſe words in the Pſalms: 'Thou *hateſt* all them that work wickedneſs.' And the ſolution is, that the reprobate are odious to God, not as being *made*, or even as being reprobate; but becauſe they are workers of wickedneſs: not becauſe of God's decree, but man's tranſgreſſion." (P. 25.) Be it ſo, ſince it pleaſes Academicus. But it may not be amiſs to ſee by what means theſe reprobates become workers of wickedneſs.

"Sæpiſſime excæcare dicitur Deus et indurare reprobos, eorum corda vertere, inclinare, impellere. Id quale erit, nequaquam explicatur, ſi confugitur ad *præſcientiam* aut *promiſſionem*. Nos ergo duplici ratione reſpondemus id fieri. Si quidem quum, ſublato ejus lumine, nihil quam caligo et cæcitas ſuperſit; quum, ablato ejus Spiritu, corda noſtra in lapides obdureſcant; quum, ceſſante ejus directione, in obliquitatem contorqueantur; rite excæcare, indurare, inclinare dicitur, QUIBUS FACULTATEM VIDENDI, PARENDI, RECTE EXEQUENDI ADIMIT. Secunda ratio, quæ multo propius accedit ad verborum proprietatem, quod AD EXEQUENDA SUA JUDICIA PER MINISTRUM IRÆ SUÆ SATANAM, ET CONSILIA EORUM DESTINAT QUO VISUM EST, ET VOLUNTATES EXCITAT, ET CONATUS FIRMAT" (Inſt. II. 4. 3.)

Calvin, in the firſt ſection of this chapter, tells us, "Quos Spiritûs ſui regimine non dignatur Dominus, EOS AD SATANÆ ACTIONEM JUSTO JUDICIO ABLEGAT;" and he adopts from Auguſtine a very curious ſimile, in which the human will is compared to a horſe, God and the Devil being the riders. The paſſage we could wiſh to inſert, as it would not fail we think, to furniſh our readers with high amuſement; but we cannot afford room for it. We muſt, however, have leave to aſk Academicus, what opinion he forms of a being, who firſt ſeduces, or rather, forces other beings into wickedneſs, and then

hates

hates and damns them for that very wickedneſs of which he himſelf is the cauſe?

"It is objected againſt Calvin," ſays our Author, in p. 65, "that he repreſents the condition of every elect hereafter, as not depending upon, nor a reward of his behaviour here." That he does ſo repreſent it, we think is evident from the following aſſertion: "Falſum eſt *Deum, prout unumquemque gratiâ ſuâ dignum vel indignum prævidet, ita vel eligere vel reprobare.*" (Comment. on Rom. xii. 2.) Academicus, however, ſuppoſes the Dean's accuſation founded on this expreſſion: "Alios ſuâ induſtriâ ſalutem acquirere, quam ſola electio paucis confert, plus quam inſulſè dicetur;" and he thus explains it. "All that Calvin contends for, in theſe words, is, that the cauſe of ſalvation, antecedent to all good works, is God's gratuitous mercy; and that no man, by his own natural efforts, can attain to ſalvation." But, in this explanation, Academicus is, to uſe his own phraſeology, peculiarly unfortunate. He either does not underſtand the paſſage from which theſe words *are* taken, or he wilfully miſrepreſents it. For, in that paſſage, Calvin is not ſpeaking of the gratuitous mercy of God as the primary efficient cauſe of ſalvation in general, but of the decree of election, as the only cauſe which makes the elect to differ from the reprobate. His object is to prove, what many of his degenerate diſciples pretend to deny, that election cannot ſtand without reprobation: and his proof is demonſtrative. "Dicitur *ſegregare* Deus quos adoptat in ſalutem: fortuitò *alios* adipiſci, vel ſuâ induſtriâ acquirere, quod SOLA ELECTIO paucis confert, plus quam inſulſe dicetur. Quos ergo Deus præterit, reprobat," &c. (Inſt. III. 23. 1.) The whole ſtreſs of Calvin's argument reſts on the ſuppoſition (the truth of which is here taken for granted) that the decree of God is the *ſole* cauſe of the *ſalvation of the elect*; and that, both with regard to the elect and to the reprobate, *character* or *behaviour* is totally excluded.

Dr. Kipling, after having, from many quotations extracted out of Calvin's writings, inferred that, according to Calvin's principles, no man is a free agent and accountable for his actions, adds, "So that Calviniſm ſuperſedes a future day of account, ſuch as is deſcribed in Rev. xx. 12, 13, and a future ſtate of retribution." For proof of this, he refers to Inſt. II. cap. xvi. 17, 18, and to III. cap. xviii. 1, 2, where Calvin, he ſays, though he does not deny that Chriſt will come to judgment, yet does deny that "ALL men ſhall GIVE ACCOUNT for their own works." But in the Athanaſian creed this is expreſsly affirmed, and, in the VIIIth Article, that creed is pronounced orthodox. Hence the Dean concludes that both the Article and the Creed are Anti-Calviniſtic.

The manner in which this argument of the Dean is ſtated and anſwered by Academicus we ſhall now exhibit in his own words, which divide themſelves into five diſtinct propoſitions. 1. "We are told that Calvin affirms, that no man is accountable for his actions, but that all men are mere machines." 2. "But the truth is, that he always repre-

ſents

ſents men as accountable." 3. "He ſays expreſsly, III. 24. 12. 'Aſſerimus *nullos* perire immerentes." 4. "Even the reprobate, according to him, 'male voluntate agit, non coactione." II. 4. 7. 5. "And again, 'Ne audeat quiſquam ſic negare voluntatis arbitrium, ut velit excuſare peccatum.' II. 2. 8." Theſe five propoſitions are very minutely examined by the very ingenious Author of the "Reply." In every one of the five there is, he alleges, a deviation from truth; and we conceive that he has fully ſubſtantiated his allegation.

1. With regard to the firſt, which pretends to ſtate what Dr. Kipling has aſſerted, his friend ſays that it is a miſrepreſentation; for that the Dean of Peterborough has *not* told us that Calvin *affirms* no man to be accountable for his actions. He has, indeed, concluded, from a vaſt number of extracts, that Calvin muſt have thought ſo. But this is not telling us what Calvin affirmed. It is telling us only what appeared to the Dean to be Calvin's opinion.

In ſupport of his concluſion, the Dean refers to Inſt. II. cap. xvi. 17, 18, the firſt ſentence of which latter ſection is this: "Hinc egregia exoritur conſolatio, quod penes eum judicium audimus eſſe, *qui nos ſibi in judicando honoris conſortes jam deſtinavit: tantum abeſt ut, in condemnationem noſtram, tribunal ſit conſcenſurus.*" In this ſentence there is a manifeſt alluſion to Matth. xix. 28. which, indeed, is pointed out by Calvin in the margin. "The high honour which Chriſt promiſed his attendants, your maſter Calvin," ſays Dr. K.'s friend, "has claimed for himſelf and his elect. You, Sir, and your Calviniſtic brethren, it ſeems, are *judices deſignati*; are to be aſſeſſors in the day of judgment; *Chriſto conſortes in judicando*; and are not, therefore, to account hereafter for what you have done here." (Rep. p. 7.) Calvin, it is true, ſays, in this ſection, "non modica certe ſecuritas, quod non ad aliud tribunal ſiſtemur quam Redemptoris noſtri." The elect, however, are not to appear for the purpoſes of being tried, and recompenſed according to the iſſue of that trial, but merely for the purpoſe of being ſeparated from the reprobate; "ad diem illum quo agnos ſegregabit ab hœdis, electos a reprobis." (Sec. 17.) After this ſeparation, "You elect," ſays Academicus junior, "are to aſcend the tribunal, and to *paſs ſentence* (for in this ſenſe it is that Calvin here uſed the word *judicare*) upon us poor reprobates; in other words, to order us to the infernal regions." (Rep. p. 8.) Calvin, in truth, could not poſſibly conſider the laſt day as a day of trial and of account; for he has repeatedly affirmed that every man's fate was, without any regard to his conduct here, irrevocably fixed ages before he was born. "Antequam naſcuntur homines, *ſua cuique ſors arcano Dei arbitrio aſſignatur.*" (Com. on Rom. ix. 14.) If ſo, what occaſion, nay what room, is there for a future trial?

2. Of the ſecond of the above propoſitions, the Author of the reply, with juſtice, ſays that a more extraordinary one was never penned. "Calvin always repreſents men as accountable!" Had Academicus affirmed that Calvin never repreſents them as ſuch, he would, certainly, have been nearer the truth. From the numerous extracts from Calvin's works produced by the Dean the following may be ſelected.

"*Æterna*

"*Æterno et immutabili Dei consilio,* quo electos diſcrevit a reprobis—æternum Dei decretum, quo apud ſe conſtitutum habuit *quid de unoquoque homine fieri vellet*—Deus, *quos visum est,* eligit—ratio non alia aſſignari poteſt cur ſuos miſericordiâ dignetur, *nisi quoniam ita illi placet*—æternum et immutabile Dei decretum, *quo aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur*—ruinam illorum *non prævideri, ſed Dei consilio et voluntate ordinari*—Quemadmodum ſoli electi ab interitu Dei gratiâ eximuntur, ita quicunque electi non ſunt, *eos manere excæcatos necesse est*—exæcari, *non eos qui suâ maliliâ id meriti sunt, sed qui ante mundi creationem reprobati sunt a Deo*—reprobos Deus *in mortis exitium creavit*—impii *destinato creati ut perirent.*"

Is all this, indeed, a repreſentation of mortals who are to give an account, in another world, for what they have done in this? Well may the Dean of Peterborough's friend thus addreſs Academicus: "What muſt the public think of you? Aſſuredly, Sir, either that you have publiſhed remarks on a book, to the contents of which you have paid little or no attention, or that you have knowingly violated the truth, in order to miſlead your readers. 'Calvin *always* repreſents men as accountable!' Does he *ever* repreſent them in this manner?" (Rep. p. 12.)

3. "Calvin ſays expreſsly, 'aſſerimus nullos perire immerentes." In the paſſage from which theſe words are taken, Calvin is endeavouring to remove the objection that, in conſequence of unconditional decrees, an imputation would lie againſt the juſtice of God. "Nec eſt timendum nequis Porphyrii diſcipulus Dei juſtitiam impune arrodat, nobis pro eâ nihil reſpondentibus. *Quum enim asserimus nullos perire immerentes, gratuitæ esse beneficentiæ Dei quod nonnulli liberantur, abunde pro illustrandâ ejus gloriâ dictum est,* ut noſtrâ tergiverſatione nequaquam indigeat." The words, therefore, which Academicus has quoted, are not an *expreſs* but a *relative* aſſertion; and they relate to Calvin's theory, which is briefly this. All men, in conſequence of Adam's fall, became corrupt and depraved. For this corruption and depravity *alone* they were juſtly and deſervedly ſentenced to condemnation. From this ſtate ſome are extricated by God, not for any worth of their own, but from a principle of benevolence in himſelf, and for the glory of his name. The reſt are kept in this ſtate of damnation and perdition, in the firſt place *deſervedly*, becauſe of the corruption and depravity of their nature; in the ſecond place *juſtly*, becauſe, by their damnation, they alſo illuſtrate the glory of God—"ad gloriam ejus ſuâ damnatione illuſtrandam." For Calvin, in the chapter immediately preceding that from which the quotation of Academicus is made, had taken care to inform us that the *juſtice* and *glory* of God are the ſame: an aſſertion which is, indeed, moſt true, but in a very different ſenſe from that of Calvin. He ſays, however, (III. 23. 8.) "Ubi mentionem *gloriæ* Dei audis, illic *juſtitiam* cogita;" after which, he goes on to ſhew that every man deſerves perdition for the corruption of his nature only.

The ſubſtance, therefore, of the preceding extract, from four words

of

of which Academicus would have his readers believe that Calvin always repreſents men as accountable, is evidently this :

" Whenſoever I have ſaid that, by the gratuitous beneficence of God, ſome men are delivered from that ſtate of perdition to which all men were deſervedly condemned for the corruption of their nature; and that all thoſe whom he does not deliver are detained in that ſtate deſervedly—*nullos perire immerentes*—on account of the ſame corruption; whenſoever I have ſaid this, which I have frequently done, I have ſaid enough for vindicating the glory of God, and conſequently his juſtice. So that were I to make no reply to the cavils of our modern Porphyrians, they would have no juſt ground for triumph." " Not one ſyllable," ſays Academicus junior, " is there either mentioned, or even intimated in this paſſage about the actions of men; yet you have produced it as a paſſage in which men are repreſented by Calvin as accountable for their actions; for of this accountableneſs you are ſpeaking. This paſſage is nothing to the purpoſe." (Rep. p. 16.)

4. With regard to the fourth aſſertion of Academicus, it is calculated entirely to deceive the reader, by leading him to ſuppoſe that Calvin aſcribed free will to the reprobate. But although he did indeed allow him *will*, it was only *a will to do evil*. The ancient philoſophers, he ſays, held this principle, " non fore hominem rationale animal, niſi ineſſet libera boni et mali electio. Qui vero," he adds, " Chriſti ſe diſcipulos eſſe profeſſi, in homine perdito et in ſpirituale exitium demerſo, liberum arbitrium adhuc quærunt, deſipiunt." (Inſt. I. 15. 8.) It was objected to his doctrine of predeſtination, that either it muſt be falſe, or man muſt be a neceſſary agent. Calvin did not diſpute the conſequence, and, to extricate himſelf from the difficulty, invented a diſtinction between *neceſſity* and *compulſion*. This diſtinction is explained in the Inſt. lib. ii. cap. 3. " Porro," he ſays, " quod libertate abdicatam voluntatem dico *neceſſitate in malum vel trahi vel duci*, mirum eſt ſi cui videatur aſpera locutio. Offendit autem eos qui *inter neceſſitatem et coactionem* diſtinguere neſciunt." But what anſwer, he aſks, would they make to the queſtions, Is not God neceſſarily good? Is not the devil neceſſarily wicked? " Ergo ſi *liberam* Dei *voluntatem*, in bene agendo non impedit quod neceſſe eſt illum bene agere; ſi Diabolus, qui non niſi male agere poteſt, voluntate tamen peccat; quis hominem ideo minus voluntarie peccare dicet, *quod ſit peccandi neceſſitati obnoxius*." He then, formally and diſtinctly, lays down his opinion on the ſubject. " Hæc igitur diſtinctionis ſumma obſervetur, hominem, ut vitiatus eſt ex lapſu, volentem quidem peccare, non invitum nec coactum: affectione animi propenſiſſimâ, non violentâ coactione: propriæ libidinis motu, non extrariâ coactione: *quâ tamen eſt naturæ pravitate, non poſſe niſi ad malum moveri et agi*." This opinion, he ſhews, was held by Auguſtine, who advanced it, he ſays, " ex piorum omnium conſenſu;" though, how this laſt aſſertion can be reconciled with what Calvin declares in another place, (Inſt. II. 2. 4.) we are at a loſs to underſtand. He there affirms, " Porro tametſi Græci præ aliis, atque inter eos ſingulariter Chryſoſtomus, in extollendâ humanæ voluntatis facultate modum exceſſerunt,

veteres

veteres tamen omnes, excepto Auguſtino, ſic in hac re aut variant, aut vacillant, aut perplexe loquuntur, ut certi fere nihil ex eorum ſcriptis referre liceat." The doctrine, however, according to Calvin, was eſtabliſhed by Auguſtine, and was maintained for nearly 1000 years after in the cloiſters of the monks. But Peter Lombard, he adds, "quum *neceſſitatem a coactione* diſtinguere neſciret, pernicioſo errori materiam dedit." (See Inſt. II. 3. 5.)

Let us now enquire what, according to Calvin, the error which Lombard occaſioned was. There obtained, he ſays, in the ſchools a diſtinction of freedom into three kinds; freedom *from neceſſity, from ſin, and from miſery*; of which the firſt was ſuppoſed ſo inherent in man that he cannot by any means be deprived of it. The other two were loſt by ſin, meaning Adam's. "Hanc diſtinctionem," ſays Calvin, "ego libenter recipio, *niſi quod illic neceſſitas cum coactione perperam confunditur.*" Calvin would, therefore, in the foregoing diſtinction, make the firſt kind of freedom *freedom from compulſion.* If, however, this opinion of the ſchools be admitted, it follows, he thinks, incontrovertibly that man has no free will to perform good works, unleſs he be aſſiſted by grace; "*et gratiâ quidem ſpeciali,* quâ *electi ſoli* per regenerationem donantur. *Nam phreneticos,*" adds, he "*nihil moror, qui gratiam pariter et promiſcue expoſitam eſſe garriunt.*" Still, he ſays, "nondum iſtud liquet, *ſitve in totum privatus* [homo] *bene agendi facultate,* an habeat adhuc *nonnullam, ſed puſillam et infirmam,* quæ per ſe quidem nihil poſſit, opitulante vero gratiâ, ſuas ipſa quoque partes agat. Id," he continues, "dum vult expedire Magiſter Sententiarum, *duplicem gratiam,* neceſſariam eſſe nobis docet, quò reddamur ad bonum opus idonei. Alteram vocat *Operantem,* quâ fit ut efficaciter velimus bonum: *Co-operantem* alteram, quæ bonam voluntatem ſequitur adjuvando." But this diviſion diſpleaſes Calvin on two accounts: 1. "quod dum gratiæ Dei tribuit efficacem boni appetitum, innuit *hominem jam, ſuapte naturâ, bonum quodammodo, licet inefficaciter, appetere.*" This notion, he ſays, is very different from that of Auguſtine, (alluding to the expreſſion of that Father, which we examined when we were conſidering the obſervations of Academicus on the Xth Article) from whom Lombard, notwithſtanding, ſeems to have taken the diviſion of grace into *operating and co-operating.* 2. In the ſecond member of this diviſion there is, ſays Calvin, an ambiguity, "quæ perverſam genuit interpretationem. Ideo enim putarunt nos ſecundæ Dei gratiæ co operari, *quod noſtri juris ſit primam gratiam vel reſpuendo irritam facere, vel obedienter ſequendo confirmare.*" This, according to Calvin, was the fatal error to which Lombard gave riſe.

Theſe obſervations are made by Calvin to ſhew, as he himſelf informs us, how he differs from the Schoolmen. Yet, from their notions on this ſubject, we may, he ſays, learn in what ſenſe they aſſigned *free will* to man. "Pronunciat enim tandem Lombardus, non liberi arbitrii ideo nos eſſe quod ad bonum et malum vel agendum vel cogitandum peræque polleamus; *ſed duntaxat quod coactione ſoluti ſumus:* quæ libertas non impeditur etiam ſi praviſſimus, et ſervi peccati, et nihil

quam

quam peccare poſſimus. (Inſt II. 2. 6.) Liberi ergo arbitrii, *hoc modo* dicetur homo, non quia liberam habeat boni æque ac mali electionem, SED QUIA MALE VOLUNTATE AGIT, NON COACTIONE." (Sect. 7.) The words, then, which Academicus quotes as expreſſive of the ſentiment of Calvin, expreſs only thoſe of Lombard. Calvin, indeed, agreed with Lombard in part, for he immediately ſays, "Optime id quidem;" but he adds, "quorſum attinebat rem tantulam adeo ſuperbo titulo inſignire?" It was not worth while to decorate *freedom from compulſion* with ſo proud a title as that of *free will*. And the original error of Lombard, according to Calvin, conſiſted, not in making men free from *compulſion*, but in making them alſo free from *neceſſity*, to which Calvin every where maintains them to be ſubject. His own opinion manifeſtly was, "that man ſins, *not indeed by compulſion, but yet by neceſſity*; and that, though he ſins *neceſſarily*, he nevertheleſs ſins *voluntarily*." Accordingly, in the opening of the 4th chapter of his ſecond book, recapitulating what he had done in the third chapter, he thus expreſſes himſelf: "Præterea *diſtinctio inter coactionem et neceſſitatem*, poſita fuit, unde liqueret eum [hominem] DUM NECESSARIO PECCAT, NIHILO TAMEN MINUS VOLUNTARIE PECCARE." Thus ſcandalouſly has Academicus attempted, in his fourth propoſition, to miſrepreſent the ſentiments of Calvin.

5. Nor has he acted more honeſtly in his fifth. Would not every one ſuppoſe the words which he has there quoted to be Calvin's? Yet they are not the words of Calvin, but of Auguſtine; and they are produced by Calvin to ſhew, not that man poſſeſſes *free will*, but, on the contrary, that the expreſſion *free will*, or *liberum arbitrium* ought never to be uſed.

In the Inſtitutes, Lib. II. 2. 7. Calvin ſpeaks thus: "Ego quidem λογομαχίας abominor, quibus fruſtra Eccleſia fatigatur; ſed religioſe cenſeo cavendas eas voces quæ abſurdum aliquid ſonant, præſertim ubi pernicioſe erratur. Quotus autem, quæſo, quiſque eſt, qui, dum aſſignari homini *liberum arbitrium* audit, *non ſtatim concipit illum eſſe et mentis ſuæ et voluntatis dominum, qui flectere ſe in utramvis partem a ſe ipſo poſſit?*" This opinion, which he thinks a pernicious error, has been embraced, he ſays, by almoſt all the moderns, who look only at the literal meaning of the words. The Fathers, indeed, he tells us, (Sec. 8.) perpetually made uſe of the expreſſion, *liberum arbitrium*; "ſed ſimul declarant quanti faciunt illius uſum: in primis Auguſtinus, qui non dubitat *ſervum* appellare. *Alicubi ſuccenſet adverſus eos qui liberum negant arbitrium*; ſed præcipuam rationem declarat quum ait, 'TANTUM NE AUDEAT QUISQUAM SIC NEGARE VOLUNTATIS ARBITRIUM, UT VELIT EXCUSARE PECCATUM.'" Calvin then proceeds to prove, from Auguſtine himſelf, that he did not hold the freedom of the human will in any proper ſenſe of the words: and the ſection concludes with Calvin's reaſon for wiſhing that the term were dropped altogether: "Quia ſine ingenti periculo non poſſe retineri cenſeo, magno, contra, Eccleſiæ bono futurum ſi aboleatur; neque ipſe uſurpare velim, et alios, ſi me conſulant, abſtinere optarim."

It

It is manifeſt, then, 1. that Auguſtine did not really believe in the freedom of the human will. 2. That he cenſured thoſe who denied it, not ſimply for their denial of it, but for the miſchievous inference, (though moſt men will think it a juſt one) which they drew from the doctrine of neceſſity. 3. That the *ſole purpoſe* for which Calvin quoted the words of Auguſtine was to ſhew, by another proof, that the term *free will* had better be expunged from the language of every nation. But Academicus, that the words might ſeem on his ſide, has not only diſregarded the context, but has craftily concealed the initial word TANTUM, that the whole might aſſume the appearance of a poſitive prohibition to deny the freedom of the human will. Calvin's works fill nine volumes in folio. If he "*always* repreſents men as accountable," Academicus, ſurely, might have found in him innumerable paſſages which clearly and unequivocally ſay ſo. He has produced, however, in proof of this poſition, only three ſcraps of ſentences, not one of which repreſents men as accountable. Are we not, therefore warranted to conclude that Calvin has NO WHERE given ſuch a repreſentation of mankind, and moreover that, as the Dean has affirmed, he did not believe in a ſtate of future retribution?

To prove the truth of this affirmation, the Dean refers, as we have already ſaid, to Inſt. Lib. II. c. xvi. 17, 18. and to Lib. III. c. xviii. 1. On the firſt of theſe paſſages Academicus remarks that "Calvin neither denies or affirms that *men* ſhall then give an account of their works." But, ſays the Author of the "Reply," "If by *men*, in this ſentence, you intended only to ſay *ſome men*, you doubtleſs would have ſo expreſſed yourſelf. But Calvin does deny, in this paſſage, that *his elect*, and, conſequently, that ALL MEN are, at the laſt day, to render an account. You have here, therefore, again deviated from the truth." (Rep. Pp. 25, 26.)

On the ſecond paſſage the Remark is this: "He (Calvin) ſays, 'God ſhall render to every man according to his works.'" (P. 26.) But no aſſertion was ever more falſe. Theſe are not the words of Calvin, but of Scripture, which his adverſaries had urged againſt his theory, and which he here repeats for no other purpoſe but to ſhew that they really contain no proof of a future day of account. It is neceſſary to lay the paſſage itſelf before our readers.

"Tranſeamus nunc ad eas ſententias quæ affirmant Deum unicuique redditurum ſecundum opera ſua: cujuſmodi ſunt, 'Unuſquiſque referet quod geſſit in corpore, ſive bonum, ſive malum. Gloria et honor operanti bonum, tribulatio et anguſtia in omnem animam operantis malum.' Et 'Ibunt qui bona egerint, in reſurrectionem vitæ; qui male fecerint, in reſurrectionem judicii. Venite benedicti Patris mei: eſurivi, et dediſtis mihi cibum; ſitivi, et potum tribuiſtis,' &c. Atque illis quoque eas conjungamus, quæ mercedem operum appellant vitam æternam: quo in genere ſunt, 'Retributio manuum hominis reſtituetur ei. Qui timet mandatum remunerabitur: Gaudete et exultate; ecce merces veſtra copioſa eſt in cœlis. Unuſquiſque mercedem accipiet ſecundum laborem.' *Quod unicuique dicitur redditurus Deus ſecundum opera* PARVO NEGOTIO DISSOLVITUR. ORDINEM ENIM CONSEQUENTIÆ

TIÆ MAGIS QUAM CAUSAM INDICAT LOCUTIO. Extra dubium autem eſt, Dominum his miſericordiæ ſuæ gradibus ſalutem noſtram conſummare, dum electos ad ſe vocat, vocatos juſtificat, juſtificatos glorificat. Tametſi ergo ſolâ miſericordiâ ſuos in vitam ſuſcipiat; quia tamen in ejus poſſeſſionem ipſos deducit per bonorum operum ſtudium, ut, *quo destinavit ordine suum in illos opus impleat: nihil mirum si secundum opera sua dicuntur coronari* QUIBUS HAUD DUBIE AD RECIPIENDAM IMMORTALITATIS CORONAM PRÆPARANTUR." (Inſt. III. 18. 1.)

On this extract from Calvin the obſervations of Academicus junior are ſo excellent, that we have not the vanity to think that we could improve upon them. We ſhall, therefore, ſimply lay them before our readers.

"Calvin maintained, as you Calviniſts now maintain, that, according to the revealed word of God, there is but one juſtification, and that this one is a juſtification by faith alone. But there were many divines in his days, as there have been ever ſince, who maintained that, beſides this juſtification by faith alone, which takes place in this life, there is another juſtification mentioned in Scripture (Matth. xii. 36, 37. Rom. ii. 13.), which is future, and which will be a juſtification for the obedience to the moral precepts of Chriſt which reſults from faith in Chriſt, that is, a juſtification by faith and works jointly. Thoſe divines, in addition to other things, objected to Calvin's theory that, if men are juſtified in this life, and then once for all, it follows, as a neceſſary conſequence, that there will not be a future reckoning. And, to prove that there will be a future day of trial and account, they adduced thoſe paſſages of Scripture, of which Calvin, in the above quotation, has given us a tranſcript. For the purpoſe of ſilencing his adverſaries, Calvin proceeds, in this ſection, to ſhew that thoſe paſſages of Scripture are no proof at all that we are hereafter to be tried, examined, and to give account. 'Quod,' ſays he, '*unicuique dicitur redditurus Deus secundum opera, parvo negotio dissolvitur.*' i. e. As to the objection which is founded on thoſe paſſages of Scripture which affirm that God will render to every man according to his works, it is very eaſily refuted. For the ſacred writers meant, by this expreſſion, not to indicate that every perſon who has obeyed the laws of God in this life, will enjoy, in the next, everlaſting felicity, *because he has been obedient*; but rather to indicate that God firſt elected certain individuals, before the creation of the world, to a futnre ſtate of glory, next prepares them himſelf for this ſtate, and, laſtly, will receive them into it. '*Ordinem consequentiæ magis quam causam indicat locutio.*' Obſerve, reader, that, in this ſeries of conſequences, no mention is made of 'books to be opened,' and of perſons 'to be judged out of thoſe things which are written in the books,' but that the elect are to be received into glory, not on account of their actions, but without any trial or reckoning.—This you produce as a proof that Calvin believed in a future day of account, ſuch as is deſcribed in Rev. xx. 12, 13. '*He* ſays, God ſhall render to every man according to his works!' Do, reader, turn back to the paſſage, and thou wilt inſtantly be convinced that Calvin ſays no ſuch thing. 'HE ſays—God ſhall render,' &c. Good Heavens! What will you, Sir, not ſay? (Reply, Pp. 27—30.)

We have thus, at laſt, brought to a concluſion our Strictures on the crafty and pernicious publication of Academicus. Our readers, we are very ſenſible, will find in them, arguments and obſervations, the

ſame

ſame in ſubſtance, ſeveral times repeated. But this was unavoidable, if we were, at all, to execute what we intended. Our object was, and we truſt that we have, in ſome degree, accomplished it, to leave none of his cavils, fallacies, and miſrepreſentations, (none, at leaſt, of any conſequence) unanſwered, and to the ſame ſophiſtical argument the ſame reply muſt, of courſe, be given. The Dean of Peterborough's pamphlet, among other excellencies, poſſeſſes, in the higheſt perfection, the merit of *unity*. In the "Remarks" of Academicus there is nothing ſyſtematical. They are unconnected, deſultory, and full of repetitions. But he thought them, no doubt, the better calculated, on that account, to puzzle thoſe who might be in danger, from the Dean's clear ſtatements and logical reaſoning, of being ſeduced from Calviniſtic orthodoxy.

We have quoted largely from Calvin himſelf; and this, our readers will perceive, was abſolutely neceſſary, in order to expoſe the diſhoneſt artifice of Academicus. But, in quoting thus largely from Calvin's writings, we had, beſides, we very frankly acknowledge, another end in view. We wiſh to call the attention of the public to the real nature and tendency of Calvin's principles; which our modern Calviniſts are ſo anxious to conceal, and keep out of view. The more theſe principles are examined, the more blaſphemous and impious they muſt appear. In order to be execrated by all men of ſenſe, they require only to be known.

In the mean time, the ſpirited, learned, and argumentative writer, who calls himſelf Dr. Kipling's friend, and of whoſe acute "Reply" we have made ſo much uſe, has thrown out an idea which, though ſeemingly ſuggeſted by him in playfulneſs, we think deſerving of ſerious conſideration. "The public has, of late years," he ſays, "been very copiouſly ſupplied with editions of elegant extracts: but no one has yet undertaken to collect and publiſh the beauties of Calvin. Such a work would, at this time, when Calviniſm is ſo very prevalent, have certainly a rapid ſale, and would, in my opinion, be a moſt ſerviceable publication." (Rep. p. 48.) Such a publication, we are really convinced, would be productive of much good; and we know of no perſon apparently better qualified to undertake it than Academicus junior. We wiſh to ſee what he has hinted in jeſt, realized in earneſt. A Collection of this kind, ſyſtematically arranged under proper heads, and accompanied with what he is ſo well able to furniſh, a connected ſeries of brief and appropriate notes and illuſtrations, would be a valuable preſent to the public, eſpecially to young divines; and would, we are perſuaded, contribute more to counteract the indefatigable and miſchievous exertions of our Calviniſtic "True Churchmen" (a conſummation devoutly to be wiſhed!) than almoſt any other expedient whatever. We therefore hope that the very ingenious gentleman will excuſe us for requeſting his attention to the ſubject.

Aubrey: a Novel. By R. C. Dallas, Esq. Author of Percival. 4 Vols. 18s. Boards. Longman and Co.

THOUGH the multitude of novels with which the press annually teems renders the reading of all impossible, and the little interest usually excited in sober minds by fictitious narratives discourages the reading of many, we are not so pedantic as to turn with disgust from the very name of this species of composition; but, on the contrary, we think a good novel a high treat; and while we protest against the frequent perusal even of *good ones* by the rising generation, who are, or should be, employed in strengthening and forming the mind, we agree with Mr. Dallas, that those parents and instructors "who know how to fortify the soul, to direct taste, and satisfy curiosity with propriety; who are acquainted with the principles that constitute health of mind and body, and who have activity enough to practise the theory they approve, may find considerable assistance in them." We have read the novel before us with a pleasure which induces us to bestow particular notice on it, we shall, therefore, after giving a sketch of the story, dwell on some of the passages with which we were gratified, and we shall as impartially point out circumstances with which we were dissatisfied.

Aubrey is the younger son of a gentleman, whose brother, Arthur Aubrey, is the representative of an ancient family of large fortune, and who, having no children, considers Aubrey's brother as his heir. He is accordingly educated as such, while Aubrey studies divinity at Cambridge, with the view of preferment in the Church. The year in which he took orders he becomes acquainted, through the accidental hospitality of Mrs. Melvil, the widow of a West Indian, with her daughter Emily, whom Lord Ludley, vainly attempting to seduce, defames. From the slur thrown upon her character, and from this Lord's practices, he rescues her, loves and marries. Previous to the marriage he becomes heir to his uncle, by the death of his brother, and knowing the improbability of obtaining his consent, secures a private marriage. This is discovered, and his uncle makes a will, by which he is disinherited, and the estate devised to a godson and relative of the old gentleman's. A reconciliation, however, takes place, and old Aubrey resolves to make a new will. He becomes very fond of his nephew's family, and makes him a large allowance during his own life. The Aubreys spend a fashionable life of ease and pleasure for many years, and, tired of its routine, go abroad in quest of novelty. They are suddenly brought back by the death of the uncle, who, it now appears, had neglected to revoke the fatal will which disinherited Aubrey. Aubrey, who, with the family in general, is described as possessing great equanimity, feels considerable depression at first, but recovers his spirits on reflecting that he had friends who would exert themselves to provide for him greatly in the Church; and, giving up Aubrey Hall, he joins his family in town, where, unaccustomed "to weigh the importance of streets in the scales

ſcales of prudence," he hires a houſe in Albemarle ſtreet. Many of his acquaintance, who had heard of his return, without the cauſe of it, haſtened to viſit him. Among other cards, he found Lord Aynſford's, a nobleman who was the patron of Mariton, a rich rectory in Leiceſterſhire, of which the incumbent was old and infirm. Aubrey ſees Lord A. who, eager to connect himſelf with a man of ſo large a fortune, promiſes the preſentation, and adviſes his friend to think of a Biſhopric. Before they part Aubrey diſcloſes his misfortune, and my Lord is ſurpriſed and ſorry, but does not recall his promiſe. Meanwhile the family ſee their friends, and very ſoon find their funds fail. Duns and ſour faces enſue: Aubrey borrows, is ſhunned by ſome of his friends, and adviſed by others. Mortifying occurrences ſucceed. The Aubreys are diſmayed. One morning, while the huſband and wife are diſcuſſing their dilemma, a ſtranger is announced as coming from Mariton. The very ſound of Mariton awakens new hope, and Aubrey, in imagination, is already inducted in the rectory. The ſtranger proves to be an old fellow collegian, who, having heard of Aubrey's misfortune, comes to offer him not the rectory but the curacy of Mariton. Aubrey is rejoiced to ſee his old friend Cowper, but neither he nor his wife can at firſt ſtomach the curacy. Cowper gives them time to think of it, as he is going out of town for a few days, and promiſes, on his return, to viſit them, and relate the occurrences of his life. In his abſence Aubrey conceives that a ſale of the paintings he had collected would enable him to pay his debts, and live till the rectory fell to him; but ſome very mortifying events induce him to determine, even after ſelling the pictures, to accept the curacy and retire to the country. Cowper is now received with double pleaſure, and relates the principal events of his life. His ſtory is extremely intereſting, and forms, ultimately, a neceſſary connection with the main ſtory of the novel. He begins by informing the Aubreys, that juſt before he left ſchool he reſcued, near Thornbury in Glouceſterſhire, a beautiful country girl from a young man, apparently a gentleman, at the expence of a drubbing and a broken arm; that ſhe inſpired him with an honourable paſſion, and that he educated her and married her. His father, though kind, and even profuſe in his liberality to him, was always reſerved, and particularly upon his affairs; and he therefore did not make his marriage known to him, but contrived to receive his allowance at the Univerſity, and to hoard ſufficient to make a decent proviſion for his wife, at her native village, Melford. His father is very anxious that both he and his ſiſter Harriet ſhould marry large fortunes. Old Cowper finds it neceſſary for his health to go to Portugal, and he carries his daughter Harriet to Oporto, leaving his ſon Charles to form a wealthy connection at home. After ſome time Cowper receives a letter from his father, urging him to come immediately to Portugal; and he is under the neceſſity of leaving his amiable wife, with her mother and his infant daughter at Melford, in their beautiful cottage called Eden-bower. On his arrival at Oporto he is informed by his father, that he wiſhed

his aſſiſtance in bringing to a ſpeedy termination an affair in which his ſiſter's honour and welfare are concerned. Smyth, a daſhing young Engliſhman of large fortune, appears to be trifling with her. He immediately calls on Cowper, to whom he ſhews himſelf to be evidently a libertine, and introduces him to Donna Seraphina de Monocella, a bewitching foreigner, who ſucceeds in enſlaving him, and diverts his thoughts from his lovely innocent Fanny. He finds that Smyth, though faſcinated by his ſiſter, is bent on love without matrimony; but matters are arranged to produce a marriage with due ſolemnity and legal authority. The family continue at Oporto. Smyth deteſts Cowper, and takes advantage of his confidence to do him every injury he can. He informs his wife of his amour, intercepts their correſpondence, and leagues with Donna Seraphina in ruining him. Donna S. wanting a ſum of money, perſuades Cowper to borrow it privately from his father's ſtrong box, by taking out two bags of moidores, which ſhe and Smyth both promiſe to enable him to replace. By her wit ſhe provides him with a falſe key. At the time he was to go to the cheſt he experiences a ſtruggle between reaſon and paſſion; the latter conquers, and he proceeds. Opening the lid of the cheſt, he finds a note to himſelf, from his father, telling him not to rob, but to take all, which is but little, and now his own by his father's death. He drops the lid, turns round, and ſees his father ſwallowing a doſe of poiſon. The old man had been informed of his ſon's deſign by Smyth, who had immediately left Oporto, deſerting his wife and child, the former advanced in her ſecond pregnancy. The contents of the cheſt are not ſufficient to pay all the debts of Cowper, and a friend of his father's lends him 500l. to carry him and his ſiſter, with her ſon Edmund, to England. With ſhame and remorſe, his love for Fanny returns as ardently as ever: he leaves his ſiſter at Briſtol, and haſtens to Melford, where he arrives at the moment of Fanny's funeral. Self-reproach and deſpair drive him to diſtraction, and he loſes his reaſon for ſome months. On his recovery he finds his money nearly exhauſted, takes a lodging for himſelf and his ſiſter in the neighbourhood of London, where he ſuffers great diſtreſs, and is at laſt thrown into the Fleet priſon. There he meets a gentleman, the nephew of the old rector of Mariton, who perſuades him to take two pupils, and ſettles his affairs. He obtains the forgiveneſs of the Vicar and pariſhioners of Melford, and fixes with his pupils, his ſiſter, his little daughter, and his nephew and niece, at Eden-bower, where he clears off his debts, and improves his little eſtate. In ſpite of the ſtricteſt enquiries, Smyth was never heard of. Cowper's repentance is ſincere, and except the deviations to which he was ſeduced by Donna Seraphina, his virtue is unblemiſhed. While Aubrey was enjoying his eaſy fortune during his uncle's life, Cowper was educating and training his child and his ſiſter's children at Eden-bower, where he is again doomed to the pangs of loſing his other Fanny—his daughter, after growing up to the years of rational friendſhip, dies. This but augments his contrition

for

for his former crime, and every action of his life, every ſentiment of his mind, is influenced by the view of joining the beloved ſpirits who have taken their flight to another world. He makes occaſional excurſions ſeeking to do good, and having heard of Aubrey's misfortune, applies to his friend, the old Rector of Mariton, for the curacy, which he comes to offer, unconſcious of the promiſe of the rectory given by Lord Aynsford. Cowper had brought his nephew, Edmund Smyth, to town, and introduced him to the Aubreys. A warm friendſhip takes place between him and Aubrey's eldeſt ſon, Arthur. They ſoon part, however, Edmund returning with his uncle to Melford, while the Aubreys remain in town, preparing for the ſale of the pictures, and the removal to Mariton. The pictures ſell for leſs than a fourth of what they were valued at. Aubrey is inſulted by a pretended connoiſſeur, and meets with freſh mortifications. In the auction his intereſt is ſupported by a young friend, Charles Senſitive, who ſtudies painting for his amuſement, having a good fortune. Previous to the ſale, Senſitive had lent Aubrey 300l. the check for which the latter had been duped of by Jack Elton, a man who, from a virtuous beginning, becomes gradually a complete villain. The Aubreys leave town in diſguſt, the whole of their fortune, amounting to 1700l. being placed in the hands of a banker, to ſupport them for the preſent. Anticipating mortifications, they arrive at Leiceſter, where they are received with open arms and affection by Dr. Searle, the old Rector. Their reception at Mariton is no leſs flattering, they forget their cares, keep much company, and are on the point of ruin when the Rector dies. Previous to the death of the Rector, a variety of intereſting occurrences takes place, and new characters are introduced and painted. Edmund Smyth viſits Mariton, and an attachment is formed between him and Emily, the elder daughter of Aubrey. Senſitive comes down to Mariton, and teaching Arthurina, the younger daughter, to paint, becomes enamoured of her. Arthur, the elder ſon of Aubrey, is ſeduced by Lady Sudley, who, ſeparated from Lord Sudley, lives in Warwickſhire. He recovers himſelf by his own remorſe and the lady's folly; and, accompanying Edmund Smyth to Melford, devotes his heart to his ſiſter Harriet. On their journey, viſiting Sudley Caſtle, near Stratford, Edmund ſaves the life of Lord Sudley. Jack Elton appears, and, ſeeming to have recovered a ſenſe of honour, returns Aubrey the 300l. he ran off with; having inherited, as he ſays, a ſmall eſtate by the death of an uncle; but the truth turns out to be, that honeſt Jack draws his funds from a gang of coiners, over whom he preſides, and he is ultimately hanged The hopes of the Aubreys, on the death of the Rector, are diſappointed; Dr. Bowes informs them of his preſentation, and comes to the rectory for the purpoſe of being inducted. Debts, duns, arreſt, execution, and other miſeries enſue. Cowper and the Smyths go to Mariton, and Aubrey is invited to be the curate of Melford. As he is compounding with his creditors, a rich Weſt Indian arrives, bringing news of an eſtate in the Weſt Indies, to

which Mrs. Aubrey is entitled, having been her father's, but in truſt to pay its debts. The gentleman purchaſes the title of the eſtate for 5000l. which enables Aubrey to pay all his debts, remove to Melford, and reſerve a ſmall capital. On the way from Melford to Mariton, Mrs. Smyth, Cowper's ſiſter, left by herſelf in a parlour at an inn, is ſurpriſed at the entrance of her huſband, but immediately loſes ſight of him, and Cowper endeavours in vain to trace him. The removal to Melford being agreed upon, the Aubreys are to meet Cowper and the whole family, who are coming to Leiceſter to be introduced to a Mr. Smyth, whom they ſuſpect to be the man they are in queſt of. In this they are miſtaken. Juſt as the family were leaving Mariton, Arthur received a letter from Lord Sudley who is dying, and thinking, by a miſtake, that he owed his life to him, intends to bequeath him his diſpoſable fortune. The ſubject is diſcuſſed among the friends, and Edmund is ſent from Warwick to undeceive Lord Sudley, whoſe enquiries reſpecting Edmund Smyth lead to the diſcovery of his being his own ſon, his Lordſhip having travelled by the name of Smyth. The whole party are aſſembled at Sudley Caſtle, and Edmund's mother acknowledged to be Lady Sudley. The emaciated nobleman repents and dies, and is ſucceeded in his title and eſtates by Edmund. While the party are all ſtill at Sudley Caſtle, Charles Senſitive joins them, and congratulates the Aubreys on the recovery of Aubrey Hall, he having himſelf, by a bold manœuvre, poſſeſſed himſelf of the laſt will of old Aubrey, which had been executed, but ſecreted by the lawyer, in a league with the pretended deviſee, and kept by the former *in terrorem* over the latter. The ſtory concludes with the proper marriages.

Such are the heads of the ſtory, and the reader will eaſily perceive that the materials are adapted to produce intereſting effects: nor has Mr. D. failed to excite the intereſt of which they are capable. The attention is kept alive from incident to incident, and we grieve to part with our acquaintance at the end of the fourth volume. But it is not alone in point of tale that we are gratified with this novel. It is full of moral leſſons for the young, the middle-aged, and the old. The general moral objects of the work are to ſhew the effect of a reverſe of fortune on different minds, and to inculcate the perſeverance, under every evil and temptation, in honeſty and virtue. The difficulty of deſcending from fortune and pleaſure to neceſſary frugality is well painted in the ſtruggles of the Aubrey family: the perpetual intention of doing right, and the recurring failure of reſolution, with the ready foſtering of hope, lead to diſtreſs as a natural conſequence. In Cowper we have a picture of a noble ſtrength of mind ſurmounting every difficulty: in Elton a ſoul yielding itſelf eaſily to the inroads of vice. In the number of incidental morals, we are highly gratified with the manner in which Mr. D. inculcates candour between parents and children; the error of inſtinctive benevolence in the character of Senſitive; the folly of an impetuous temper, and the good ſenſe of avoiding duels honourably; but we are particularly pleaſed with the paſſages relative to the clerical character.

In

In making Aubrey a clergyman, negligent of his profeſſion for a great part of his life, he enforces a ſtrict attention to the divine objects of it, and expoſes the wickedneſs of taking orders merely for the ſhew of a profeſſion, or with the view of preferment ſolely. The following extract on this ſubject will be read with pleaſure.

" Emily, my love,' ſaid he to Mrs. Aubrey, ' how negligent have I been of my profeſſion! but I do not wonder, when I conſider the motives on which I embraced it. I conſented to aſſume the ſacred robe and band, in order to provide for the ſecond ſon of a family, in whoſe repreſentative it was thought neceſſary to centre the wealth and pride of their anceſtors: when, therefore, by the death of my brother I became that repreſentative, is it ſurpriſing that I diſengaged myſelf from an object no longer neceſſary for the purpoſe for which I had obtained it? Could I go back to the time while it was optional, retaining the judgment of my experience, no intereſt whatever ſhould prevail upon me to undertake the holy office, for I ſhould not think myſelf, at that early period of life, equal to the ſtrict diſcharge of its duties. It is an awful engagement; the moſt important that man can enter into, made voluntarily with his Creator, to labour to inſtruct his fellow-creatures in the knowledge of their eternal intereſt, to purify their hearts, to reſolve their doubts, to conſole them in affliction, and to keep them on their guard in the hours of joy and tranquillity. A miniſter is the vicegerent of the Almighty. How ſublime the thought! how arduous the taſk! who that reflected upon it, would haſtily undertake it? What talents, what virtues are requiſite to form that ſtupendous character which ſtands forth the ambaſſador of the Deity! In the courſe of my reflections, ſince my reverſe of fortune, an extraordinary thought occurred to me on this ſubject. My fancy formed a new creature; I imagined the miniſtry of religion aſſigned to a ſuperior order of beings, continued by ſucceſſion, like men, on our planet. Not a fallen, nor incorporeal race; not ſuperior to man in faculty, nor exempt from the paſſions of the mind, but endowed with a ſtrength of virtue that ſhould preſerve them genuine and good, and poſſeſſed of the higheſt degree of human knowledge and talents; fully acquainted by intuition with the nature of the appetites, yet totally free from them; their frames, while exiſting on earth, ſuſtained by ſome unperceived fluid inhaled with the air, and after the ſervice of fifty years, their ſpirits tranſlated unknown to men, leaving ſucceſſors to riſe from their bodies by a new law of nature. Of ſuch a being ſelf-excellence and ſucceſs in his miniſtry would neceſſarily be the ſupreme good, the end and enjoyment of his exiſtence; to ſuch a being the taſk would be appropriate; but for me, ſcarcely arrived at years of diſcretion, placing the chief praiſe of religion in a rhetorical eſſay delivered from the pulpit, bred up in eaſe, and fond of it; for me to dare accept the divine deputation was no leſs monſtrous, than my total neglect of it, when it became unneceſſary to worldly enjoyments, was ſhameful."

The following paſſage, extracted from Cowper's ſtory, will ſerve as a companion to the foregoing. Speaking of the ſtrong and worthy character of the pariſhioners of Melford in general, Cowper proceeds thus:

" Struck with this effect, when the abatement of more vivid contemplations permitted it to recur to my mind, I was led to inquire for a cauſe, and I found a very natural one: for three ſucceſſive generations, the pariſh of Melford had been bleſſed with vicars of a truly paſtoral character; and the actual incumbent, whom the pariſhioners had in a body petitioned to yield

to the advice of his phyſicians, and go abroad, to ſave his life and gain new health, was the ſucceſſor of his father; for the preſentation of the vicarage belonged to an elder branch of the family. The venerable vicar whom he ſucceeded had lived upwards of forty years among them: as he grew old, his ſon acted as his curate; and they had both, with apoſtolic ſincerity and ardour, devoted themſelves to the care of the ſouls entruſted to them. They did not confine their miniſtry to a cold reading of the liturgy, and weekly common-place expoſitions of obſcure texts; they did not even deem preaching and praying their principal duty. The going to church they conſidered as periodical meetings for the purpoſe of general praiſe, thankſgiving, and ſupplication; and the ſermon as a lecture read by the father of a family: but they were far from conſidering it as the beſt opportunity of rectifying the underſtanding, improving the hearts, and forming the ſouls of their pariſhioners for ſalvation. The chief ſervice they rendered them was through the means of friendly condeſcenſion and familiar talk. The doctrines of their Bible were not neatly put by to be neatly produced on ſet occaſions; but the precepts of their Maſter, his life, and death, the ſtate of mankind, and the neceſſity of induſtry, were inculcated in private in an eaſy, chearful manner; as a kind phyſician explains the nature of his friend's malady, and the qualities of the medicine which he preſcribes for his reſtoration. They ſowed the ſeeds of true religion and ſound ſenſe, without mixing the grains of enthuſiaſm. They evinced the intereſt of laying up a treaſure in another life, from the certainty of leaving this; but, at the ſame time, inculcated honeſt employment in this as one of the means of amaſſing that treaſure; and taught, that the exceſſive fervour which was unfavourable to temporal duties, was, in that very reſpect, unfavourable alſo to eternal hopes. In ſhort, the inhabitants of Melford, their fathers and their children, had been ſo tutored by their amiable and eſtimable miniſters, that the natural glow of the human mind, neither producing on the one hand an independent arrogance, nor, on the other, running into imaginary fervours and ſuperſtition, had formed, if I may ſo expreſs myſelf, that humble dignity of ſoul which marked the character of my fellow-pariſhioners, and in which, I hope, they are not ſingular. But I digreſs, Aubrey, and uſurp your province."

In general the characters and manners are preſerved throughout, and ſome of the perſonages introduced afford ludicrous ſcenes. The *converſazione* and concert at Spicer Hall are highly finiſhed, and all the Spicers well pourtrayed.

After ſo much approbation, we are ſorry to expreſs diſapprobation; and were it not for the eſteem in which we hold the author, we ſhould certainly ſuffer the ſubjects of the latter to be eclipſed by thoſe of the former. The events towards the concluſion are too much hurried, and the whole of the fourth volume bears evident marks of haſte. This is the more ſtriking, as, in the preceding part, having pictures in detail, and likewiſe the operation of feelings in detail, the mind is not prepared to be hurried on as it is at the cloſe of the work. It ſeems as if the author had been anxious not to proceed to a fifth volume, for the fourth is almoſt the bulk two of the preceding ones, and he regrets, in a note near the end, that he has not *room* to interweave the death-bed repentance of Rocheſter, the witty debauchee. As

there

there was no fear of the reader's being fatigued, we wiſh that the work had been extended to another volume. The incident of the will, recovered in an improbable manner by Charles Senſitive, is unworthy of the author. If he thought the reſtoration of Aubrey-Hall neceſſary to ſatisfy common novel readers, he ſhould have adopted other means; but we are confident that thoſe who are not common novel readers would have been better pleaſed to have heard no more of Aubrey-Hall, for there was ſufficient in the unexpected news of the eſtate in St. Kitt's for poetical juſtice.

The caſtle ghoſts confirm our opinion that the author thought it neceſſary to write for the many as well as for the few; like thoſe dramatiſts, who, in the more delicate ſcenes of comedy, interſperſe paſſages ſuited to the galleries. We were aſtoniſhed to find in a novel a diſſertation which we ſhould certainly never have thought of looking for but in ſome treatiſe on orthoepy, reſpecting the pronunciation of the words *knowledge* and *oblige:* but being with great art introduced at Mrs. Spicer's *converſazione*, we were led into it without repugnance, and were repaid by the ingenuity it diſplays. We would extract it had we room to ſpare, but we recommend it to the attention of the clergy, as well as to the performers on the ſtage.

As a ſubject for cenſure we were at firſt diſpoſed to ſelect the intereſt excited for Cowper, becauſe there is no greater danger than that ariſing from leading the heart to an affection for an immoral character. Cowper marries clandeſtinely, is ſeduced from his wife, and perſuaded to rob his father; yet his ſtory, which is admirably told, intereſts us ſo much in his favour, that we rather pity and love the man than deteſt his crimes. At the concluſion of his ſtory we marked this for reprehenſion, but proceeding in the novel, we ſoon changed our ſentiment, not becauſe he is ſignally puniſhed, but becauſe he is a model of a firm, manly, and early repentance; no trifler with his conſcience, no barterer with his paſſions. His deviation was the reſult, not of a depraved nature, but of powerful ſeduction; it took place at a period of life when the underſtanding is ſtill immature, and its duration was ſhort. He returns with vigour to the path of virtue, and, as we ſaid before, preſents a picture of a noble ſtrength of mind ſurmounting every trial. Let thoſe who delight in ſhedding the tear of ſenſibility peruſe the account of the loſs of his daughter; ſo ſimple, ſo eloquent, ſo pathetic. Connecting it with a paſſage in the preface, we believe it to be an exemplification of the truth of the Horatian precept,

> Si vis me flere, dolendum eſt
> Primum ipſi tibi.

None but a father, and a bereaved father, could have written thoſe pages.

We have not at preſent ſpace for copious extracts, and believe it unneceſſary to give them, as we have no doubt that the volumes themſelves are generally read.

Godwin's

Godwin's *Life and Age of Chaucer.*

(*Continued from P.* 44.)

AT this period firſt occurs the memorable name of Wickliffe. He was of humble birth, but of tranſcendant abilities, and of a moſt ardent mind. The monkiſh hiſtorians, while they load his principles with the moſt virulent invective, ſeem at a loſs for words to do juſtice to his talents. He early roſe to the higheſt diſtinctions which Oxford could beſtow. In 1361, when 37 years of age, he was elected maſter of Baliol College. But he was then conſpicuous only for the eminence of his powers, the profoundneſs of his diſquiſition, and the dignified gravity of his private character.

In 1371 a curious tranſaction occurs. The Lords and Commons petitioned the King for the removal of churchmen from the great offices of ſtate. This circumſtance, as our author obſerves, muſt have had its origin in ſome intrigue. The parliaments of Edward III. were, by no means, ſo powerful as to dictate to the throne. Mr. G. with ſeveral of our old hiſtorians, attributes it, with great appearance of probability, to the King of Caſtille, who was at this time poſſeſſed of great power. The attack ſeems chiefly to have been directed againſt William of Wykeham, then chancellor, a perſon of the greateſt eminence in his own times, and entitled to the veneration of poſterity on account of his munificent eſtabliſhments at Wincheſter and Oxford. Wykeham was of obſcure parentage; and, for ſuch education as he received, is ſaid to have been indebted to ſome charitable and beneficent patron. He never was of either univerſity, and his contemporaries were accuſtomed to call him unlearned. His ſagacity, however, and natural abilities, were certainly extraordinary. He was early placed about Edward III., and won the heart of that ſplendid prince by his ſkill in architecture. He rebuilt Windſor caſtle on a plan of his own; and that ſtately edifice remains to this day, nearly in the ſtate in which Wykeham left it. He was perfectly qualified for ſucceeding as a courtier. He was a man of buſineſs, ſober, ſagacious, and penetrating; handſome in his perſon, and dignified in his demeanor. As a politician he was ſo wary, that hiſtory has doubted to rank him either among the ſupporters or oppoſers of Wickliffe; but it cannot be ſuppoſed that ſuch a man as Wykeham was the patron of innovations which ſtruck at the whole influence of the Church. Before he was a biſhop, he poſſeſſed benefices to the value of 873l. 6s. 8d., of preſent money 13,100l. *per annum.* With reſpect to his ſecular promotions, (the emoluments of which are not included in this account,) in 1359 he was made Clerk of the Works; in 1364 Keeper of the Privy Seal, and Secretary of State; and in 1367 Chancellor. In 1366 he was, at the recommendation of his royal maſter, elected Biſhop of Wincheſter, in which city he had been educated, and at a village in the neighbourhood of which he was born. This ſee was his own choice; but as Edward was then engaged in a conteſt with the

the Pope, it was apprehended that difficulties might occur in obtaining a bull for his conſecration, without which he could not hope for reſpect from his brethren of the bench. The affair was, however, adjuſted through the interference of the Duke of Bourbon, one of the hoſtages for the ranſom of King John of France, who took a journey to Avignon for the purpoſe, and whoſe ſucceſsful exertions ſeem to have been rewarded by the admiſſion of himſelf to ranſom in the following year.

Such was the miniſter whom John of Gaunt undertook to diſplace. The intrigue was well managed. The whole tranſaction appeared the leſs invidious, as Gaunt was then employed on the continent, and, by means of the repreſentation of the *two Houſes*, (which our author inaccurately calls the *two eſtates*,) a decent fall was prepared for the royal favourite. This event, however, is certainly a proof of a great alteration having taken place in the ſentiments of our anceſtors with regard to the eccleſiaſtics. The clergy were long the only perſons, whoſe knowledge and practice in buſineſs fitted them for conducting public affairs. Churchman, accordingly, ſucceeded churchman, in the higheſt offices of ſtate, as if by natural inheritance. "It became a part, as it were, of the religion of our anceſtors, to ſee high office combined with the clerical character; and it appeared a ſort of ſacrilege in their eyes, to behold a chancellor of the realm, or a treaſurer of the public revenues, otherwiſe habited than in the veſtments and rochet of a dignified clergyman" (p. 134.) The petition of parliament againſt them, therefore, in 1371, our author, with great plauſibility, conſiders as a proof of the progreſs of the opinions of Wickliffe. The hiſtory, indeed, of this wonderful man has not, as yet, been ſufficiently inveſtigated to fix the exact ſeries of the events of his life. But the progreſs of his tenets was almoſt miraculous. Knighton, the monkiſh hiſtorian, aſſures us that, in 1382, eleven years after the date of this tranſaction, every ſecond man throughout England was a Lollard. This is, doubtleſs, the exaggerated language of indignation; but it ſerves to ſhew the extenſive dominion eſtabliſhed over the minds of his contemporaries, by the daring intrepidity and deciſion of this reformer's genius.

Our author preſents us with a rapid ſketch of the diſaſtrous campaign of the Engliſh in France in 1372; of the celebrated march of the King of Caſtille in 1373; of the negociations and truces between the two kingdoms. In 1372 we find Chaucer on an embaſſy to the republic of Genoa; from which city, as our author thinks, he croſſed the country to viſit Petrarch, then at Padua. This opinion is chiefly founded on the two following verſes in the "Clerk of Oxenforde's" narrative in the Canterbury Tales. The clerk's narrative, which is the exquiſite ſtory of patient Griſildis, he tells the company that he

> "Lerned at Padowe of a worthy clerke—
> Fraunceis Petrarck."

But this evidence we do not think very valid: for ſuch fictions are, by

by no means uncommon; and poets have always been indulged in the uſe of them. Mr. Tyrwhit doubted of this interview of our Engliſh poet with Petrarch; and is treated again, by Mr. G., with too little reſpect. But Mr. G.'s whole reaſoning, on this occaſion, ſeems built on fanciful and gratuitous ſuppoſitions. The following paſſage is written in a ſtyle which we muſt unequivocally condemn. Speaking of the ſurpriſe which Petrarch muſt have felt on diſcovering ſo fine a genius in a native of the barbarous iſland of Britain, Mr. G. ſays,

"The diſcovery [which] he made was ſcarcely leſs aſtoniſhing than that of Columbus when he reconnoitred the ſhores of the weſtern world. He interrogated his gueſt; he propoſed to him his moſt trying and difficult criterions; he exchanged with him the glances of mind, and the flaſhes of a poet's eye. Chaucer had already written his Troilus and Creſeide, and many of his moſt meritorious productions; he was now more than 40 years of age; we may imagine how he anſwered the ordeal of the Italian, and ſtood up to him with the ſober and manly conſciouſneſs of a poet to a poet. Petrarca heſitated, ſuſpected, and at length became wholly a convert; he embraced the wondrous ſtranger from a frozen clime, and foreſaw, with that ſort of inſpiration which attends the cloſing period of departing genius, the future glories of a Spenſer, a Shakeſpear, and a Milton." (Pp. 151, 152.)

On the affected language here employed we ſhall make no remarks. But how does our ingenious author know all this to be true? It is meant, we doubt not, as an inſtance of what he calls, in his preface, "carrying the workings of fancy, and the ſpirit of philoſophy, into the inveſtigation of ages paſt." To ſuch effuſions of fancy we are, in no caſe, inclined to allow much merit; but, if an author will indulge in them, why, in the name of common ſenſe, are they thus to be clothed in the garb of hiſtorical narrative and fact? This is a liberty which no man can be authoriſed to take; and, to ſay the truth, we conceive that ſuch reflections are, with better effect left to the reader's own imagination, than obtruded by the writer.

In 1374 we find Wickliffe appointed, with ſix other perſons, of whom the chief was John Gilbert, biſhop of Bangor, to meet the Pope's commiſſioners at Bruges, for ſettling a diſpute reſpecting the Papal proviſions and reſervations. The appointment of Wickliffe was undoubtedly owing to the King of Caſtille, who now entirely directed the Engliſh government. The ſame year Chaucer obtained a grant of a pitcher of wine, to be delivered daily, in the port of London, for the term of his life, by the King's chief butler. This grant leads our author into ſome very curious and valuable diſquiſitions, illuſtrative of the manners of the times, and of the ſtate of the poet's fortune at different periods of his life. The circumſtance of the wine's being delivered daily, affords a preſumption that it was daily conſumed; and our author computes that, at this time, the poet's income cannot be ſuppoſed to have been under 1000l. per annum of our preſent money. He ſeems, indeed, to have been of a gay, convivial temper, inclined to expence, and to pleaſurable indulgences. His income, though liberal, was probably too limited compared with his expenditure;

penditure; for, in about ſix weeks after the former grant, he received a much more conſiderable mark of the royal bounty, being made comptroller of the cuſtoms in the port of London.

We have, with our author, no doubt that, for this comfortable ſituation, Chaucer was indebted to the King of Caſtille: but the ſpeech in which, on this occaſion, he makes that prince addreſs the poet, is a ſtill more reprehenſible flight of imagination, and in a ſtill worſe taſte, than what we lately quoted on the ſuppoſed interview of Chaucer and Petrarch. John of Gaunt, ſays Mr. G., "probably held to Chaucer a language ſomething like this:

'You are in the full vigour of your age and conſtitution. That this vigour ſhould be employed in the ſervice of your country, will be equally advantageous to you and to me. The reins of the Engliſh government are confided to my hands; I ought not to withdraw myſelf from this reſponſibility, if I deſired it. I want your advice; I want the aſſiſtance of your talents. I ſhall often feel prompted to conſult your admirable judgment, the rectitude of your views, and your knowledge of the world, and of the human heart; and it is more frank and manly that the man whoſe counſels I purſue ſhould fill an oſtenſible office, than that he ſhould be my adviſer ſecret and unavowed. You owe yourſelf to your country and your friend; and I require this at your hands. On the other ſide, if you deſire poetical fame, your compliance with my wiſhes will aſſiſt your attainment of that object. Man is a complex being, and is affected with mixed conſiderations; and your contemporaries will liſten with far different feelings to your beautiful and elevated productions, if they flow from an ambaſſador and miniſter of ſtate, than if you remained obſcurely ſheltered under your natal roof in the city in which you were born, or ſequeſtered among the groves and ſtreams which adorn your neighbourhood at Woodſtock." (Pp. 177, 178.)

Our author, in p. 180, adverts to a moſt curious inſtance of groſs impoſition in the Biographia Britannica. The queſtion reſpects a grant of 20 merks *per annum*, ſuppoſed by Speght, the coadjutor of Urry, and Tyrwhit, to have been conferred on Chaucer in 1371. The author of the article "Chaucer," in the Biographia, as evidence of this grant, refers with confidence to "45. Ed. III. p. 3. m. 7.;" eſtabliſhed abbreviations, which mean "Patent rolls of the 45th year of Edward III. part (or roll) third, membrane (or ſkin) the ſeventh." Mr. G. in order to eſtabliſh or refute the ſtatement of the Biographia, undertook the taſk of carefully examining the patents of that year. The rolls are only two; there is no third part. So that, as he obſerves, "the whole reference is of that ſort which is beſt known by the appellation of a 'Fabrication of Hiſtory;' of which," he adds, "ſeveral other inſtances occur in the article of Chaucer, in the Biographia Britannica."

Mr. G., as uſual, gives an able analyſis of Chaucer's poem called "The Houſe of Fame;" but for this we muſt refer our readers to the work itſelf. He here treats modern reviewers and journaliſts, whom he calls "the ſpawn of a more recent period," with very little ceremony; but *on us*, we truſt, he will be ready to acknowledge that his

his ſarcaſm has produced no irritating effect. In the thirty-eighth chapter he reſumes the progreſs of Wickliffe's opinions, of which he preſents a good conciſe account. He mentions as the forerunners of Wickliffe, the Waldenſes and Albigenſes. The firſt, he ſays, appear to have been "merely melancholy enthuſiaſts, who inſiſted that the rich among them ſhould ſell all [that] they had, and divide with the poor; and required their clergy to be illiterate, poor, and deſtitute, like the fiſhermen who firſt taught the religion of Jeſus." (p. 211.) The ſecond were, undoubtedly, heretics of Gnoſtic deſcent, who held that the material world was the work of an inferior deity, the enemy of the great Supreme Spirit. They conſequently thought that Chriſt aſſumed a body in appearance only, and *only ſeemed* to expire on a croſs. It has, to own the truth, very often ſurpriſed us, that we Proteſtants ſhould glory, as we generally do, in theſe ſectaries as our progenitors, and boaſt of tracing the reformation from their tenets: for their whole merit and reſpectability ſeem to have centered in the ſingle point of their oppoſition to the Church of Rome. Wickliffe himſelf, our author ſays, was a predeſtinarian, whoſe "creed tended to repreſent the Creator of the world as an arbitrary being, capriciouſly deciding upon the fates of mankind." (p. 215.) "It was ſimilar to that of Calvin, a gloomy doctrine, equally condemned by the underſtanding, and revolting to the heart." (p. 216.) The doctrine of Calvin is here characteriſed with admirable juſtneſs and truth; but we do not conceive that the notions of Wickliffe were exactly the ſame. He appears to have been a fataliſt, in the ſtrict ſenſe of the word, who held with the ancient ſtoics, and with our modern philoſophical neceſſarians, that nothing could have happened otherwiſe than it does; and that to this neceſſity the deity, as well as all other beings, is inevitably ſubject. The following part of his character, however, is drawn with great judgment and knowledge of the human heart:

"Wickliffe was too nearly, what has ſince been underſtood by the term, a puritan. He did not ſufficiently take into conſideration ſome of the fundamental properties of the human mind. He did not enough regard man as the creature of his ſenſes. He was too ſeverely inclined to ſtrip religion of its ornaments. Enthuſiaſm, founded upon abſtractions alone, is a ſhort-lived paſſion. It may be lively and operative in one generation, but it will ſubſide into torpor in the next. In the ordinary and tranſient concerns of human life, we rarely feel a ſtrong and permanent attachment but to what we ſee. In like manner in religion, we never can have a ſyſtem, uniform, genial, and nutritive of the pureſt affections and habits, without the ſolemnities of worſhip, the decencies of architecture, the friendly alliance of harmonious ſounds, or the fragrance of delicious odours." (p. 217.)

Mr. G.'s thirty-ninth and fortieth chapters are very important, and in ſeveral reſpects, we think highly objectionable. The firſt relates the proceedings of the parliament in 1376, which was called the Good Parliament. A confederacy was formed againſt John of Gaunt, who was accuſed of a deſign to alter the ſucceſſion. Gaunt was then

on

on the continent, ſo that the machinations of his enemies had unlimited range: for Edward III., on account of his infirmities, had almoſt wholly withdrawn from public affairs, and the death of the Black Prince was expected daily. The Commons firſt preferred a long bill againſt the uſurpations of Rome; to which, however, the King, who lay ſick at Eltham, coldly replied, that "he was purſuing other means of redreſs." The Commons then proceeded againſt the miniſters, whom they charged with malverſation. Richard Lyons, farmer of the ſubſidies and cuſtoms, Lord Latimer, chamberlain, and Lord Neville, with ſeveral of inferior ſtation, were committed to priſon; the property of Lyons and of Neville was confiſcated; and Latimer was fined 20,000 marks.

The parliament then adopted a meaſure, with which our author is highly offended, and which, he ſays, "can reflect nothing but diſgrace on the parties concerned." This was obliging the King to part with a woman named Alice Pierce, or Perrers, who, for the laſt ten years of Edward's life, ſeems to have governed him with abſolute ſway. Mr. G. ſuppoſes Wykeham to have been at the head of the confederacy which occaſioned this ſeparation; and "it was," he ſays, "a ſhameleſs example of ingratitude for this man, who owed every thing to the bounty and partiality of his Sovereign, thus to trample upon his dotage, and to drag his private weakneſſes and foibles to the view and condemnation of the world. It was barbarous to dictate, in this unfeeling manner, to a monarch who had once been the arbiter of Europe; and to tear from the aged prince, now in his ſixty-fifth year, a companion and confident whom habit had rendered neceſſary to him. It is not eaſy to find an inſtance in the records of hiſtory, in which private pique has in a more indecent and unprincipled manner prompted the conduct of a public character." (P. 233.) On theſe reflections of our author we muſt have leave to obſerve, that he has produced no proof either that Wykeham was the inſtigator of the proceedings againſt Alice Perrers, or that he had any pique againſt her or the King. Indeed, the tenderneſs here expreſſed for the royal weakneſſes ſeems intended only to blacken Wykeham, againſt whom Mr. G. evidently entertains the moſt violent prejudice, for no other reaſon that we can conceive, but becauſe that prelate had been injured by Mr. G.'s great favourite, John of Gaunt, and may therefore be ſuppoſed to have felt ſome reſentment. We know not whether our ingenious author was always ſo indulgent to the foibles of kings. But his ſuppoſitions, on this occaſion, are not very conſiſtent. In the committee appointed by this parliament for tranſacting public buſineſs were the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, Wykeham, Biſhop of Winchester, and Courtney of London. Of theſe three prelates the firſt, Mr. G. ſays, was ſuppoſed to favour Gaunt; but if this was the caſe, it is very improble that a parliament, convened by the intrigues of the other two, in the opinion of our author, for the very purpoſe of ſubverting Gaunt's authority, ſhould have placed him on the committee of government. Another of Mr. G.'s ſuppoſitions is ſtill

more

more wild; namely, that Courtney (whom he juſtly ſtyles "the moſt imperious churchman of his times") and Wykeham combined with the Wickliffites, whoſe avowed object was the downfal of the Church of Rome. The truth ſeems to be, that, through the dotage of the King, and the inſolent rapaciouſneſs of his concubine, the government was become intolerably corrupt, ſo that parliament was forced to interfere, and commit the management of public affairs to ſuch as they thought beſt qualified for the truſt.

One principal object, Mr. G. thinks, of the proceedings againſt A. Perrers, was to throw a ſtigma on the private character of the King of Caſtille, who was now living in open adultery with the ſiſter of Chaucer's wife. His marriage with the Spaniſh princeſs was unhappy. "John of Gaunt, however," ſays our author, in language not at all equivocal, "though he had thus married, *had not abjured the feelings of a man.*" (P. 229.) He therefore, it ſeems, indulged theſe feelings by amuſing himſelf with the governeſs of his daughters. Our author, we conceive, would have acted more wiſely in paſſing this part of his favourite's conduct without any reflections. But he is determined to find fault with Wykeham, and with the party of whom he makes that prelate the head. His opinion we ſhall ſimply lay before our readers; *et valeat quantum valere poteſt.*

"It is undoubtedly much to be regretted, that perſons, occupying ſo eminent a ſtation, ſhould ſet ſuch an example of diſregard to thoſe inſtitutions and forms which are eſſential to the maintenance of the eſtabliſhed order of ſociety. But none but a bigot will affirm an error of this ſort to be of ſuch magnitude, as to diſqualify a man, who is by his birth, according to the conſtitution of his country, called to a certain ſtation, from diſcharging its functions, or entering upon its privileges." (Pp. 230, 231.)

On hearing of theſe proceedings, the King of Caſtille haſtened to England, diſſolved the confederacy, and inflicted vengeance on ſeveral of its members. But Wykeham was the principal object of his revenge. Several articles were exhibited againſt him; but the only one on which he was found guilty, was a charge of having, while chancellor, reduced the amount of fines, particularly the fine of one individual from 80 to 40 pounds. Our author affects to doubt, whether this charge was ſelected as of eaſieſt proof, or whether the others were paſſed by from motives of clemency. But motives of clemency are out of the queſtion. The King of Caſtille was evidently enraged, and would certainly have ruined Wykeham if he could. The natural concluſion undoubtedly is, that the other charges could not be proved. The temporalities of his biſhopric, however, were ſeized, and he was forbidden to come within 20 miles of the Court. On this occaſion our author has a reflection which we cannot but conſider as diſgraceful and abſurd. It ſhews how completely he allowed, for a time, his partiality for Gaunt to extinguiſh in his mind, both the principles of juſtice, and the feelings of humanity. "Wykeham," he ſays, "had been ſo aſſiduous and ſucceſsful in the accumulation

lation of wealth, that he might well ſpare the revenues of his biſhopric during the time when he was thus under a cloud, without having any great injury to appeal to as a topic of complaint." (P. 247.) Gaunt held a parliament, which revoked the proceedings of the former year, againſt Latimer, Perrers, and the reſt. That the King of Caſtille ſhould exert himſelf to diſſolve the committee of government was natural; but his recall of Alice Perrers ſhewed a profligate contempt of public cenſure. And his rancorous enmity againſt the Biſhop of Wincheſter is demonſtrated by the circumſtance that, when an act of general pardon was paſſed, Wykeham was the only exception. His diſgrace, however, did not long continue. "His friends," ſays Mr. G. "were powerful, and the King of Caſtille was placable." Of this *placability* our author gives, indeed, a moſt curious proof. "A ſeſſion of the convocation was held, when Courtney, Biſhop of London, noticed the abſence of the Biſhop of Wincheſter, and moved that no ſubſidy ſhould be granted to the King, till that prelate ſhould appear in his place. Moſt of the biſhops concurred in the propoſition; *and it was urged with ſo much ſpirit that the government at laſt thought proper to comply.*" (P. 259.) On June 18, 1377, three days before the death of Edward III., a writ was iſſued for the reſtitution of Wykeham's temporalities, on condition of his paying a certain ſum of money for the ſervice of the war.

Soon after the coronation of Richard II. the King of Caſtille retired from the government; but he previouſly took care of the intereſts of Chaucer. On the very next day after Edward's death, the grant of his office of comptroller of the cuſtoms, as alſo that of his former penſion, was renewed; and, inſtead of his daily pitcher of wine, he received a compenſation of 20 marks *per annum*. Our author, in this place, again expoſes a ſingular forgery in the Biographia Britannica, which notices the two laſt grants, and, for authority, refers to "Pat. 1. R. II. p. 13." and to "Pat. 1. R. II. p. 19." But, ſays Mr. G., "there are no ſuch rolls. The terms 'part the thirteenth,' and 'part the nineteenth,' are abſurd to any perſon accuſtomed to conſult the records in the tower. The record of the patents of any one year ſometimes conſiſts of a ſingle roll, frequently of two rolls, which, in that caſe, are indorſed Parts I. and II., and I believe never exceed three." Theſe grants are firſt mentioned by the author of Chaucer's life, prefixed to Urry's edition, who does not, however, ſpecify his authority. Indeed, our only knowledge of them is derived from a patent of the 11th Richard II., in which they are pretty fully recited, and which permits Chaucer to reſign in favour of another. This patent is imperfectly printed in a ſubſequent page of the Life in Urry. "But the writer of the article in the Biographia did not," ſays Mr. G., "exactly underſtand this. Finding no official references in the book from which he drew his information, he has thought proper to invent references of his own, thus giving his eſſay an appearance of accuracy to the caſual reader, exciting diſapprobation and contempt in the elaborate and informed, and poiſoning, to the extent of his power,

the fountains of hiſtorical knowledge, and the confidence which every reaſonable man would deſire to repoſe in the integrity of hiſtory." (Pp. 273, 274.)

The King of Caſtille ſoon became unpopular; and our author thinks that it was to vindicate his patron, that Chaucer wrote his poem called "The Complaint of the Black Knight." We do not conceive that Mr. G. has very ſucceſsfully made out his hypotheſis; but, in the courſe of his remarks on the poem, he has (Pp. 286, 289) favoured us with ſome excellent obſervations on the paſſion of love, and on the ſentiment of loyalty, as modified by the principles of chivalry. They are too long, however, for inſertion, and would be greatly injured by abridgment. But we cannot, by any means, beſtow the ſame praiſe on ſome ſentiments of our author, on occaſion of the poll-tax, which, in 1381, excited the famous and terrible inſurrection, conducted by the miſcreants who are known by the names of Wat Tyler and Jack Straw. "This," he ſays, "was the period of the awaking of the human mind. This was the æra of the *ſacred doctrines of equality*; doctrines which, if temperately and ſeriouſly weighed, are fraught with ineſtimable benefits, but if raſhly, ſuperficially, and irreverently acted upon, are the plagues of mankind, involving their diſciples in the moſt fearful calamity, and bringing diſcredit upon the principles of juſtice and truth. Unfortunately," he adds, "it is this haſty and intemperate proceeding to which the maſs of mankind are prone." (P. 307.) That this is, and always muſt be, the caſe we are perfectly convinced; and the ſimple conſideration of the fact ſhould have ſhewn our ingenious author the danger of conſecrating the principle. But how comes Mr. G. to be ſo confident that the "*ſacred* doctrines of equality," as he calls them, are "the principles of juſtice and truth?" We are certain that theſe doctrines are totally inconſiſtent with every ſtate of civilized ſociety; and that, though it were attempted to carry them into practice, they would not ſubſiſt for a ſingle day. Inſtead of being *ſacred*, they are tranſcendantly *execrable*, and as falſe in theory as they are deſtructive in fact. We are, therefore, inclined to conſider this paſſage as another ſacrifice to the ſentiments of Mr. G.'s former friends.

At p. 316. our author delineates the views which he ſuppoſes the events of Tyler's inſurrection muſt have naturally produced in the mind of Chaucer; and he then indulges himſelf in a reverie, which is ſingularly viſionary, with regard to the influence of political freedom on the powers, and what he would call the *ſpringineſs*, of genius: as if no works of genius had ever been produced, except where men were politically free. This is mere declamation below contempt, and as contrary to ſobriety of reaſoning as it is to fact. He then traces the events which brought John of Gaunt under the neceſſity of ſeeking ſafety in Scotland; and his 44th chapter commences with the marriage of Richard in 1382 to Anne of Bohemia, a princeſs of high accompliſhments and merit, whoſe conduct gained her, from contemporaries

contemporaries and poſterity, the appellation of the "Good Queen Anne."

This chapter we regret, that the length to which our obſervations have been extended will not permit us to analyze; for we look on it as one of the moſt valuable in the book. It contains a judicious and well-written account of the "Legende of Gode Women," one of Chaucer's beſt productions, compoſed, it is probable, at the requeſt of Queen Anne, in praiſe of the ladies, by way of atonement for the ungallant ſeverity with which they were ſatirized in "Troilus and Creſeide," and in the "Romaunt of the Roſe." Mr. G. gives an intereſting view of the plan of the poem, in which the vices of the male ſex are humorouſly exaggerated. And here he introduces a curious account of the poetry, and poetical worſhip, of the DAISY, (or, according to Chaucer's fanciful etymology, DAY'S EYE,) illuſtrated by an excellent analyſis of another of Chaucer's poems, the "Floure and the Lefe." The original of this laſt, our author gives good reaſons for thinking, was the production of a lady. The chapter cloſes with a pleaſing account of the ſhorter and more airy claſſes of poetry, which were then in vogue; the Chant-royal, the Balade, the Rondeau, the Paſtourelle, and the Virelaie. The whole of this chapter is highly creditable both to the taſte and to the judgment of our author.

Mr. G.'s 46th chapter purſues the affairs of Wickliffe. In the laſt year of Edward III., an injunction had been publiſhed, forbidding the diſſemination of his doctrines; but this intrepid reformer treated it with contempt. The clergy, however, obtained five bulls againſt him from Rome, which likewiſe ſeem to have had little effect. In the beginning of 1378, he was cited to Lambeth; but the populace roſe, and forcing the doors of the apartments where his judges were aſſembled, began to harangue them in his favour. The meeting broke up without coming to a deciſion; and Wickliffe was formed to derive advantage from ſuch a favourable event. Our author, very happily, compares the exertions of this reformer and of his aſſociates with thoſe of the Methodiſtical teachers in the 18th century. Hitherto he had been ſupported by the Univerſity; but his attack on the doctrine of tranſubſtantiation, the moſt ſacred myſtery of the Romiſh Church, ſtartled his beſt friends. His opinions on this ſubject were formally condemned by the Chancellor and ſeveral of the doctors in that learned body. Wickliffe, on this, appealed to the King, and ſolicited the protection of his old defender, John of Gaunt. At the inſtigation, probably of Courteney, now primate, a bill was, in 1382, brought into parliament, empowering the ſheriffs to detain in priſon the preachers of hereſy and their abettors, till they ſhould be juſtified according to the law and reaſon of holy church. The fate of this bill, as recorded by our author, was moſt extraordinary. The bill, he tells us, did not paſs the Commons; yet it certainly is entered, as law, on the records, and remains, to the preſent day, on the ſtatute book.

Wickliffe, however, was expelled the Univerſity, and ſeveral of his adherents recanted.

Hume reproaches theſe early reformers as not being "actuated by the ſpirit of martyrdom," and our author defends them by as extraordinary a piece of caſuiſtry as we have ever ſeen. His reaſoning is nothing leſs than a plea for groſs hypocriſy and moral diſhoneſty.

"We admire," he ſays, "and juſtly, the ſpirit of the perſecuted individual who refuſes to qualify, by a ſingle ſyllable, what he once maintained to be truth; but we may be permitted to queſtion the wiſdom and moral rectitude of his conduct. If he be, which the notion of martyrdom implies, a lover of virtue and of mankind, ſurely his life, though compelled to ſilence upon certain topics, will be more beneficial than his death. I ought not to ſign a paper containing ſentiments oppoſite to my own, to obtain a ſum of money or an office; but I would as willingly do this at the requiſition of a Chief Juſtice as of a highwayman, if, while he graſps the paper in one hand, he preſents a halter or a piſtol with the other. Nothing ought to be refuſed by me, when death is the alternative of refuſal, except that which would ſo deſtroy my character and honour, as to make the further prolongation of my life a burthen and a curſe." (Pp. 392, 393.)

Is there, then, no diſhonour or ſtain in ſolemnly profeſſing what we inwardly diſbelieve? This, to a man of conſcience and of virtue, would certainly make his life "a burthen and a curſe." Putting a future world out of the queſtion, he is a mean and deſpicable wretch, who ſacrifices truths of the higheſt importance to conſiderations of perſonal ſafety. Such conduct tends to deſtroy all confidence in human veracity; and the life of the man who adopts ſuch maxims can never be regarded as beneficial to the world. The following reflections, however, we inſert as extremely judicious and replete with ſound ſenſe:

"In religious innovation, as in almoſt all critical poſtures of human affairs, there is much of good and much of evil. The literature and the mind of Europe are, and long will be, deeply indebted to Wiccliffe, and to John of Gaunt his patron. They were eminent inſtruments in removing that night and torpor in which we had ſo long been involved. But there is a ſtern and a rugged character in reformation, particularly religious reformation, which we muſt deplore, while we love the general reſult. Hiſtory informs us, and we might eaſily have concluded that it was ſo, that Wiccliffe and his confederates were copious in their abuſe of all preachers who were not of their ſect; ſtyling them falſe brethren, imps of ſatan, and warning their followers to give no ear to their doctrines. Sarcaſm and invective, ſtirring up the angry paſſions of mankind, have almoſt always been the reſources of innovators. We read of an inſtance in which two of the preachers, being at a loſs for wood to boil their proviſions, chanced upon a wooden image of St. Catherine; and, chopping it in pieces, jocoſely remarked that Providence muſt have been concerned in ſending them ſo ſeaſonable a ſupply. They familiarly ſtyled our Lady of Walſingham the Witch of Walſingham. There is an internal evidence in this phraſe, which may well guarantee to us that it was not the invention of their calumniators. But the tendency of ſuch licentious language muſt have been to ſhock the pious and the

the worthy, and to overturn the principles of the weak and unſtable. With the unenlighted and unthinking part of mankind, the whole circle of moral principles is bound together. They are faſtened upon them by education, and confirmed by habit. Things ſacred in themſelves, are not ſacred in their eyes from an intrinſic claim, but as connected with time and place, with outward ceremonies and ſolemn obſervances. It is only a virtue founded in principle, and nurtured in the genial ſoil of a well-ordered mind, that will ſurvive unhurt, when the prejudices upon which it is uſed to lean for ſupport are no more. We may, therefore, reaſonably conclude, that Wiccliffe and his partizans did much of, at leaſt temporary, miſchief. They diſturbed the viſions and poetic forms of morality and religion. They offended the pious; they ſapped the virtues of the unſteady; and they introduced a general ſpirit of groſſneſs and illiberal ſarcaſm. We ought not to wonder that they had many enemies, nor to believe that all who perſecuted them were actuated by a deſpotic temper or by ſordid motives." (Pp. 394, 395.)

We have already dwelt ſo long on Mr. G.'s work, that we are under the neceſſity of now ſhortening our ſtrictures.—In his 47th chapter he enters into a minute examination of a production once extremely popular, eſpecially among the followers of Wickliffe, intituled The Viſions of Pierce Plowman. This work, of which the author is ſaid to have been Robert Langland, a prieſt of Merton College, in Oxford, and which ſeems to have been written between 1347 and 1356, is commonly divided into twenty *Paſſus*, or Cantos. It is extremely miſcellaneous; but in general may be regarded as a ſatire on the vices of almoſt every profeſſion, eſpecially of the clergy; which laſt circumſtance greatly endeared it to the Lollards of the poets time, as well as to their ſucceſſors in attempts at reformation. The perſonages are allegorical; but the pictures of manners, in almoſt every claſs of life, are highly valuable. The ſpecimens produced by our author are curious, and of no mean merit, the verſification is of a ſingular kind, of which the moſt ſtriking feature is the ſtudied introduction of three different words, beginning with the ſame ſound in every line; thus,

> " *W*yſt I that, quod the *W*oman, I *W*ould not ſpare
> *F*or to be your *F*rende, fryer, and *F*ayle you never."

This alliteration, to a modern ear, does not ſeem capable of producing much harmony; but Mr. G. thinks that the verſes of Langland are conſtructed, with many deviations indeed, on a principle ſufficiently rhythmical, and that, when perfect, they are anapeſtic, conſiſting of four feet, of three ſyllables each, the laſt ſyllable of each foot receiving the emphaſis. We have a compariſon of Langland and Chaucer, full of good criticiſm, which our limits will not allow us to tranſcribe.

In 1384, the Court was engaged in a violent conteſt with the citizens of London about the election of a Mayor. The popular candidate was John of Northampton, who had been Mayor the two preceding years. He ſeems to have been a magiſtrate of a turbulent and ſeditious turn, like Beckford, and ſome others of a later date.

Nothing could ſhew more clearly our author's determined reſolution to blacken the government of Richard, than the ſtyle in which he talks of this civic conteſt. "The proceedings of the Court," he ſays, "were regarded by their authors as the firſt ſtep towards the deſtruction of the King of Caſtille." Can any aſſertion be more poſitive or preciſe? The Court's interference in the affairs of the city was meant as a prelude to the ruin of Gaunt. Yet, in the very next ſentence, Mr. G. allows that between the two he can trace no connection. "There was ſome link of combination, that we are now unable to diſcover, which made the deſtruction of the city's liberties an indiſpenſible preliminary to the ruin of John of Gaunt." (P. 442.) This is, ſurely, prejudice with a witneſs. In the conteſt, however, Chaucer took a part, by ſupporting the popular cauſe. But a proſecution was commenced againſt him, and he was forced to flee for ſafety to the continent.

One Friar Latimer, however, preſented a paper to the King, in which Gaunt was charged with a formed deſign to uſurp the crown. Time, place, and other circumſtances were ſpecified; and the friar ſwore, on the ſacrament, to the truth of the accuſation. Gaunt, however, who had been informed of the charge, ſuddenly entered the preſence of Richard, and, after having the ſcroll put into his hands, defended himſelf with much vehemence and force. He inſiſted on a thorough inveſtigation of his conduct, and that his accuſers ſhould, in the mean time, be committed to cloſe cuſtody. Richard ſeems to have been convinced of his uncle's innocence, and delivered Latimer to the care of two knights, who were to be anſwerable for his appearance when required. One of theſe knights was Sir John Holland, the king's uterine brother, who had married the eldeſt daughter of Gaunt. Under the pretence of diſcovering the perſons who had ſuborned the friar to accuſe his father-in-law, Holland ſubjected the miſerable man to the torture, under which he expired; and this iniquitous proceeding, as might have been expected, increaſed the ſuſpicions againſt John of Gaunt.

The miniſters of Richard were determined, however, to bring Gaunt to his trial, and to arraign him before a parliament aſſembled for the purpoſe. It is curious to contemplate the force of prejudice, in the part adopted by our author on this occaſion. He repreſents both the king and his confidential ſervants as the verieſt miſcreants that ever exiſted. The miniſters, he ſays, "conſidered that Richard, however ſpecious and engaging might be his manner to ſtrangers, had a mind to which the principles of rectitude had never been communicated, or in the ſoil of which the ſeeds of rectitude refuſed to germinate." But this, we apprehend, is infinitely unlike the character of Richard. On the contrary, this much injured prince was diſtinguiſhed for ſome of the moſt amiable virtues which belong to human nature. He was mild, forgiving, and affectionate. As a maſter he was kind, and as a huſband his conduct merited, and has obtained, univerſal praiſe. Such a man could not poſſibly be the monſter that M. G.

has

has painted. Richard ſeems, indeed, like many other princes, to have been, *by his virtues themſelves*, diſqualified for defending himſelf againſt the attacks of the unprincipled traitors by whom he was ſurrounded. Yet his miniſters, if we may believe Mr. G. "had only to repreſent to him his venerable uncle as the bar to his licentiouſneſs, in order to obtain his aſſent to the blackeſt project [which] they could ſuggeſt to him." Our author then goes on to inform us, as if he had been preſent, what theſe profligate miniſters ſaid to the king. "They told him that he was a monarch. They aſked him for what purpoſe the plenitude of power was committed to his hands, if he was not to uſe it for the removal of obſtacles to his enjoyment! They aſſured him that the people would never preſume to inquire into the reaſons of his meaſures, &c." (P. 453.) Again, we beg leave to aſk how does Mr. G. *know* all this? Suppoſing Mr. G.'s prejudices well founded, we can eaſily *fancy* that the miniſters of Richard would talk in this ſtyle. But in point even of taſte, we have great objection to ſuch fancies being clothed in the language of hiſtory. The King of Caſtille, however, withdrew to his ſtrong Caſtle of Pomfret; and at laſt, by the mediation of the Princeſs of Wales, mother to the King, a reconciliation was effected. But the turbulent Woodſtock was not to be appeaſed, and had ſoon an opportunity of carrying his treaſon into full effect.

(To be concluded in our next.)

The Life and Correſpondence of Samuel Richardſon, ſelected from the original MSS. bequeathed by him to his Family. To which are prefixed a Biographical Account of that Author, and Obſervations on his Writings. By Anna Lætitia Barbauld. 6 vols. 12mo. 2l. 5s. Phillips, London. 1804.

THE lives of eminent writers may be rendered more pleaſing and inſtructive than moſt other ſubjects of biography, by perſons who know the facts, and comprehend the characters which they propoſe to exhibit. Richardſon, in the preſent work, has found a biographer capable of eſtimating his talents, and acquainted with the claſs of literature in which they were exerted. She ſees how he found fictitious biography, how he left it, and what he has done. Although the novels of Richardſon clearly and ſtrongly diſplay his intellectual powers, moral principles, and ſentiments, they afford us only the knowledge of reſults. His private life, illuſtrated by his correſpondence, unfolds the progreſſion of his habits and character, the incidents and circumſtances in his hiſtory and conduct, which tended to give a Clariſſa to the world. In his life and letters we are enabled to ſee the compoſer as well as the compoſition, and to trace thoſe excellencies of wiſdom and virtue, that fill us with delight and admiration to the cauſes in which they originated.

The fair editor very naturally and properly begins with ſtating the

proofs that the correſpondence is authentic; and they are equally conciſe and clear. Mr. Richardſon was not only accuſtomed "to preſerve the letters of his numerous correſpondents, but to take copies of his own, generally by the hands of his daughters, particularly his daughter Martha, and his nephew, who performed to him the office of amanuenſis." After his death they remained in the hands of Mrs. Anna Richardſon, his laſt ſurviving daughter. That lady having died in the beginning of the preſent year, the letters became the property of Mr. Richardſon's grand-children, from whom they were purchaſed by Mr. Phillips.

Our editor introduces the life of Mr. Richardſon with a view of fictitious adventures from the time of Amadis de Gaul, down to the period at which her hero took up the pen; and traces the variations of that ſpecies of literature on the continent, until the appearance of Gil Blas. Thence ſhe proceeds to Engliſh fictitious adventures, which ſhe attends from Sidney's Arcadia to Robinſon Cruſoe and Gulliver's Travels. Beſtowing on the principal works which ſhe mentions ſhort criticiſms that at once characterize the individual compoſitions, and mark their ſtage in the progreſs of that kind of literature, ſhe obſerves, "there was ſtill wanting a mode of writing which ſhould connect the high paſſion and delicacy of ſentiment of the old romance, with characters moving in the ſame ſphere of life with ourſelves, and brought into action by incidents of daily occurrence." This was the want which ſhe regards Richardſon as deſtined to ſupply. The following character of this new kind of writing, executed by ſuch hands, preſents at once a juſt view of the inventor, and a high idea of the critic.

"Richardſon was the man who was to introduce a new kind of moral painting; he drew equally from nature and from his own ideas. From the world about him he took the incidents, manners, and general character, of the times in which he lived, and from his own beautiful ideas, he copied that ſublime of virtue which charms us in his Clariſſa, and that ſublime of paſſion which intereſts us in his Clementina. That kind of fictitious writing, of which he has ſet the example, diſclaims all aſſiſtance from giants or genii. The moated caſtle is changed to a modern parlour; the princeſs and her pages to a lady and her domeſtics, or even to a ſimple maiden, without birth or fortune: we are not called on to wonder at improbable events, but to be moved by natural paſſions, and impreſſed by ſalutary maxims. The pathos of the ſtory, and the dignity of the ſentiments, intereſts and charm us; ſimplicity is warned, vice rebuked, and, from the peruſal of a novel, we riſe better prepared to meet the ills of life with firmneſs, and to perform our reſpective parts on the great theatre of life."

The manner of this writer, ſhe obſerves, was alſo new. There are three modes of carrying on a ſtory; the narrative or epic, in which the author himſelf relates the whole adventure, as Cervantes in Don Quixote, and Fielding in Tom Jones. A ſecond mode is that of memoirs, as Smollett in his Roderick Random, and Goldſmith in his Vicar of Wakefield. Thirdly, is the mode invented by Richardſon, epiſtolary

epiſtolary correſpondence. Our editor, with great ability, deſcribes the reſpective advantages and diſadvantages of theſe three modes. She allows the laſt to be the moſt artificial and moſt difficult, although practiſed by Richardſon with ſuch diſtinguiſhed ſucceſs. Having diſcuſſed the kind, form, and character of the writings, our editor conducts us to the author.

Samuel Richardſon was born in 1689, in Derbyſhire, but the place is unknown. It is ſaid he wiſhed to keep a myſtery over the ſcene of his nativity, in order to conceal the obſcurity of his original circumſtances. If this notion be well founded, it merely proves that men of genius and virtue are not exempted from frivolous weakneſs; a diſcovery of very long ſtanding. He was intended for the church, but the misfortunes of his father, who was once a joiner in good repute, prevented the completion of his deſign. He received but a ſmall portion of claſſical erudition, knew no language but his own, and that without the accuracy or preciſion of a ſcholar. From his early age, however, he had a great turn for reading, and when obliged to take to a buſineſs, he choſe the employment of a printer, in hopes of thereby increaſing his opportunities of procuring books. For ſeven years he was apprentice to Mr. John Wilde of Stationers' Hall; was remarkable for profeſſional aſſiduity and ſkill. Much, however, as his time was occupied, he ſtill found leiſure for expanding his mind by reading. Having for ſeveral years worked as a compoſitor, corrector, or overſeer of the preſs, he about the age of thirty ſet up for himſelf, firſt in Fleet-ſtreet, and afterwards in Saliſbury-court. He alſo began to write for bookſellers, indexes, prefaces, and dedications. Thence he roſe to political papers, and procured the printing of the journals of the Houſe of Commons. As he advanced in circumſtances he was choſen maſter of his company, and procured a country reſidence; but continued very attentive to buſineſs. He loved to encourage diligence and early riſing amongſt his journeymen, and often hid half a-crown amongſt the letters, ſo that the firſt who came to work in a morning might find it. At other times he brought for the ſame purpoſe fruit from his garden." He was twice married, firſt to the daughter of his old maſter, Mr. Wilde, and ſecondly, to the ſiſter of Mr. Leake, bookſeller. By both wives he had many children; the greater number of whom died in their infancy; but ſeveral daughters lived to maturity. Mr. Richardſon had always been very fond of writing letters; and being employed by bookſellers, they deſired him to give them a volume of familiar epiſtles, on a variety of ſuppoſed occaſions, in order to teach common people to write letters. Richardſon agreeing to the general propoſition, ſuggeſted the propriety of extending the object. Suppoſe, ſaid he, we ſhould inſtruct our humble readers not only how to indite, but how to act in caſes very likely to occur. The bookſellers on this hint were the more urgent with him to begin. Accordingly he undertook the taſk, and compoſed a ſtory which was founded on the following real occurrence: A gentleman riding through part of England, one day was ſtruck with the appearance of a very fine houſe which

which he beheld from the road. Arriving ſoon after at an inn, and inquiring of the landlord concerning the ſplendid manſion, he was told that the hiſtory of the owner and his lady was much more remarkable than the villa and grounds, attractive as they were. The proprietor was a Mr. B. whoſe mother had taken a very beautiful girl of low rank to be her ſervant, when only twelve years of age. The girl at fifteen was become ſo charming, as to captivate the eldeſt ſon of her miſtreſs, and the old lady dying, he endeavoured to ſeduce the beautiful object of her protection. He put various ſtratagems in practice, but all in vain; her virtue reſiſted every application, and her prudence baffled every artifice. At length he made her his wife, and both became the delight and admiration of the country, in which the property of Mr. B. was very extenſive. This ſtory the gentleman imparted to Mr. Richardſon, and he thought no tale could better anſwer the purpoſe of his engagement with the bookſellers. He ſet about it, and from it wrought up the novel of Pamela.

This production, publiſhed in 1740, enraptured the public, and procured to the author a high degree of literary reputation. The criticiſm of our editor on this work is in many reſpects juſt, though perhaps in ſome partial. Joſeph Andrews, the firſt novel of the inimitable Fielding, is repreſented as having been a parody on Pamela; and in the hero and heroine moſt probably with truth. Richardſon was a downright author, and never forgave this ridicule on one of his intellectual children. He always endeavoured to vilify Tom Jones: he himſelf imputed his obloquy to the delicacy of his virtue, which was ſhocked by the looſeneſs of ſome parts of that performance; but as his editor acutely remarks, he could tolerate Cibber. Mrs. Barbauld, with her uſual diſcrimination, marks the difference between thoſe eminent maſters of Engliſh novel-writing; but we do not entirely agree with her in ſuppoſing Richardſon far ſuperior in pathetic to Fielding. Richardſon certainly much *oftener appeals* to tender feelings than Fielding, but not MORE STRONGLY. There are various paſſages in Tom Jones, and many more in Amelia, which intereſt the beſt and moſt tender feelings as much as Clementina or Clariſſa.

The fame of Pamela encouraged Richardſon to perſevere in the ſame ſpecies of writing; and Clariſſa Harlow drew forth all the energies of his genius and pathos; and uniformly exerted them in inculcating and ſtrengthening virtue in deterring and degrading vice. Our editor's criticiſm on Clariſſa is a very maſterly ſpecimen of taſte, judgment, and knowledge of the human mind. Clariſſa Mrs. Barbauld juſtly prefers to Sir Charles Grandiſon; and very properly beſtows leſs detail of analyſis on the latter than the former; but ſhe dwells on it with ſufficient particularity to ſhew ſhe is thoroughly acquainted with the work and its merits.

Richardſon has doubtleſs earned a reputation which will deſcend to poſterity; but in the circumſtances of his life we find cauſes which led his genius to be over-rated by himſelf and his friends. The circle in which Richardſon chiefly moved conſiſted of perſons very much inferior

inferior to him who were gratified by his notice, and in return regarded him as a kind of a god. Samuel Richardſon relatively to his daughters and their companions aſſembled round him at North End, was as extraordinary a phenomenon as Samuel Johnſon among the whole circle of literary characters. The friends of Richardſon adopted his opinions and prepoſſeſſions, echoed them to himſelf and others, and by acquieſcence confirmed him in various judgments that were actually erroneous. Did he vilify Tom Jones, and predict its ſpeedy conſignment to oblivion? his aſſociates concurred in the ſame cry. Did he repreſent Amelia as taſteleſs and inſipid? they all called out that Amelia was a vapid performance. A reader, therefore, of his life or correſpondence muſt guard againſt partial impreſſions on ſubjects that called forth the prejudices of the hero. Keeping himſelf, however, free from this bias, he will find in the letters a great portion of entertaining and uſeful matter. Richardſon was the warm friend of religion and virtue; and a ſpirit of piety and morality breathes through theſe letters, as well as through his illuſtrious works. Some of his correſpondents are men of high literary eminence, for inſtance Dr. Young, and Mr. Warburton, and all of them ſeem to be well acquainted with what was paſſing at the time. The whole correſpondence is intereſting, as a view of the manners, ſentiments, and opinions which prevailed in enlightened and elegant ſociety during thirty or forty years of the laſt century. The general topics are literature, human nature, paſſion, and conduct, as exhibited in this country during the period of the correſpondence, interſperſed with a great variety of biographical anecdotes, both amuſing and inſtructive.

His firſt correſpondence, of much frequency or extent, ſeems to be with Mr. Aaron Hill, a writer of ſome talents; but not ſo well received by the public as he conceived himſelf to deſerve. From the benevolence of Richardſon he experienced great kindneſs. His grateful ſenſe of ſuch goodneſs, the unpleaſant circumſtances in which he was himſelf placed, the neglect of his works, his conſolation from anticipations of the praiſe which they were to enjoy from poſterity, and his angry conſignment of authors then eminent to future oblivion, are the chief ſubjects of Hill's letters. Striking pictures they are of a diſappointed author railing againſt thoſe who have caught the public favour, and ideally balancing accounts, by humbling with future ages thoſe who are exalted in the preſent, and exalting thoſe who are now humbled. A letter dated September 10, 1744, ſoon after the death of Pope, with ſeveral others of ſomewhat later date, are fine inſtances of an inferior writer endeavouring to bring his ſuperior below his level. In October 1748, Mr. Richardſon wrote Mr. Hill a letter, in which he blames the world for not more highly rating the productions of Mr. Hill. To the intimation implied in this cenſure Mr. Hill anſwers: "I really thought, dear Sir, that neither my affection, admiration, or warm grateful ſenſe of your inimitable virtues, could have admitted the increaſe given to it, by the ſincere, kind, friendly plainneſs of this laſt obliging letter. Yet it tells me nothing

new

new of the low eſtimation of my writings. I have always known them, and expected them to be, unpopular: nor ſhall I live to ſee them in another light. But there will riſe a time in which they will be ſeen in a far different one: I know it, on a ſurer hope than that of vanity." The chief value of Mr. Hill's letters is the repreſentation of an unſucceſsful author charging his diſappointments on the public taſte; or any cauſe but the want of merit. Their next value is the extravagant commendations of Richardſon's works, and the favourable reception ſuch panygerics experienced from a ſucceſsful author accuſtomed to be praiſed. The whole of this part of the correſpondence is a diſplay of human nature, the ſelection of which confers high honour on the judgment of the editor. The letter of Mr. Warburton is valuable, as a teſtimony of the eſtimation in which he and his friend Mr. Pope held the firſt production of Richardſon's genius. Mr. Strahan's letters are agreeable deſcriptions of the ſtate of ſome parts of Scotland, which he viſited in a tour about the year 1750. Letters between Mr. Richardſon and Mr. Cave ſhew the eſtimation in which the Rambler was held at its firſt appearance.

The ſecond volume opens with a correſpondence between Mr. Richardſon and Dr. Young, and contains very valuable letters on both ſides on a great variety of ſubjects, including criticiſms on Clariſſa, of which Dr. Young was a warm admirer. Lovelace he hopes will put an end to that race of fine gentleman, who for ſeveral ages were the heroes of comedies, including the Sir Charles Eaſy of Cibber.

Mr. Richardſon was generally ſurrounded by young ladies to whom he read his productions as they came freſh from his head and heart; and uſed to aſk their opinion of the fable and characters as they unfolded themſelves. Of theſe ladies were Miſs Fielding, ſiſter to the great Fielding, and a Miſs Collier. Both theſe were his correſpondents; the letters are intereſting in demonſtrating the hero's mode of inſtructing the female ſex; and amuſing in ſhewing the pleaſure which he derived from having the changes rung on his works. A correſpondence between Richardſon and Mrs. Pilkington ſhews how low a woman, adorned with wit and beauty, and the moſt brilliant accompliſhments, may fall when ſhe abandons herſelf to pleaſurable vice. Theſe letters all deſerve quotation; but as we know not which to ſelect in preference we ſhall refer them to the reader at full length. He will find them from page 113 to 157 in this volume. Letters which follow from Colley Cibber very happily preſent the characteriſtic features of that writer; agreeable vivacity, without much genuine humour, and readineſs of remark, at once ſharp and ſlight. The remainder of the ſecond volume is occupied by a correſpondence with Mr. Kennicot, on a commemoration at Oxford; letters between Mr. Duncombe, Miſs Highmore, and Miſs Mulſo, on various ſubjects, but moſt frequently on Clariſſa, and Grandiſon, and what is amuſing as an inſtance of the egotiſm of even eminent authors, much of the alluſion to theſe novels is from Mr. Richardſon himſelf. One of the chief conſtituents in Mr. Richardſon's letters to ladies and to gentle-

men

men with whom he was on a footing of familiar intimacy, is eaſy particularity of detail. In ſome of his epiſtles he hits very accurately the fluency, variety, and rapid tranſition which ſo much engage a reader of ſenſibility to female accompliſhments, in the letters of well-educated ladies. From theſe epiſtles we ſee that the ſtyle and mode of the compoſitions in his novels were entirely the reſult of nature and habit, and not of effort. In writing to Miſs Highmore, he expatiates as his own Miſs Byron would do in writing to Aunt Selby.

The third volume begins with a correſpondence between Mr. Richardſon and Mr. Edwards. Who Mr. Edwards was we do not find much from the biography; but, from Mr. Richardſon's account, as well as from his own letters, he appears to have been a good, kind-hearted man, who lived at Turrick, in Buckinghamſhire, and wrote a book called the "Cannons of Criticiſm." Clariſſa is one of his ſubjects, and he regards it, not only as all men of taſte and judgment do, but as the particular friends of Richardſon do, as the firſt work which ever had appeared. In theſe letters of Mr. Edwards, as well as of others of Mr. Richardſon's intimates, there is a very manifeſt imitation of the epiſtolary ſtyle of Richardſon. One of the moſt important benefits ariſing from the correſpondence of an eminent man on confidential ſubjects is, that his letters and correſpondence lay his mind more fully before a reader than his formal acts and publications. We find Mr. Richardſon has written much more to his coterie of ladies, and to ſuch gentlemen as Mr. Edwards, than to any correſpondent who was his own equal. This proves that vanity and the low deſire of being *head of the company* was very prevalent in Mr. Richardſon, though both a good and a wiſe man. In one of Mr. Edwards's letters we find him talking of Dr. Johnſon as Whitelocke did of *one* Milton. Writing to ſo intimate a friend, to whom, on Prince Henry's principle, he could unboſom himſelf without ceremony, Richardſon abuſes Tom Jones and Amelia. A rival author will be a rival author. After Mr. Edwards follows Mrs. Klopſtock. It appears that this lady had fallen in love with an old gentleman becauſe he had written a book upon the Meſſiah. The ſubject of her correſpondence is the peruſal of this poem, and her captivation from that peruſal, with the praiſes of her huſband. The letters between Mr. Richardſon and Miſs Mulſo appear to have been written partly while Sir Charles Grandiſon was going on, and partly after that novel was finiſhed. The chief ſubjects, therefore, are critical diſquiſitions on Sir Charles, Clementina, and Miſs Byron. Letters between Mr. Richardſon and Miſs Weſtcombe are chiefly on domeſtic incidents and the affections which are connected with them; they place the goodneſs of Mr. Richardſon's heart, and the tenderneſs of his feelings, in a very favourable light. Some of Miſs Weſtcombe's anſwers contain various amuſing anecdotes of faſhionable characters, ſuch as the Miſs Gunnings, afterwards Ducheſs of Hamilton and Argyle, and the Counteſs of Coventry, and Miſs Chudleigh, afterwards Ducheſs of Kingſton.

Miſs

Miſs Weſtcombe is married, and with congratulations on that event the third volume cloſes.

The fourth begins with a correſpondence between Richardſon and Dr. Delany. This part of the work has for its chief ſubject Clariſſa, with ſome ſtrictures upon Tom Jones. Mrs. Donnellan pretends to undervalue Amelia, and to call its author poor Fielding. Richardſon was delighted with ſuch criticiſm, and, in anſwer to that lady, in half a page exhibits a fine ſpecimen of literary rivalry. It is an attack upon the three diſtinguiſhed productions of the great father of Engliſh comic romance, Joſeph Andrews, Tom Jones, and Amelia. "Parſon Young (ſays this letter of Richardſon) ſat for Fielding's Parſon Adams, a man he knew, and only made a little more abſurd than he is known to be." The beſt ſtory, in the piece, is of himſelf and his firſt wife. In his Tom Jones, his hero is made a natural child, becauſe his own firſt wife was ſuch. Tom Jones is Fielding himſelf, hardened in ſome places, ſoftened in others. His Lady Bellaſton is an infamous woman of his former acquaintance. His Sophia is again his firſt wife. Booth, in his laſt piece, again himſelf; Amelia, even to her noſeleſsneſs, is again his firſt wife. His brawls his jarrs, his gaols, his ſpunging houſes, are all drawn from what he has ſeen and known. As I ſaid (witneſs alſo his hamper-plot) he has little or no invention: and admirably do you obſerve, that, "by ſeveral ſtrokes in his Amelia, he deſigned to be good, but knew not how, and loſt his genius, low humour, in the attempt." But for theſe defects which he had in common with other human beings, the benevolence and agreeable eaſe of Richardſon's letters compenſate. About the middle of the fourth we find a correſpondence between Richardſon and Mrs. Sheridan, mother of the living orator. She conſults Mr. Richardſon on her Novel of Sidney Biddulph, of which, it appears, he approved. The other parts of this correſpondence refer to the purſuits of Mr. Sheridan, and the praiſes of Clariſſa and Grandiſon. A correſpondence aroſe between Mr. Richardſon and Lady Bradſhaigh on the ſubject of Clariſſa, four volumes of which had been publiſhed before the work was finiſhed. This Lady, in a letter, ſigned Belfour, begs the cataſtrophe may not be tragical; and a very ingenious controverſy takes place between the author and his fair correſpondent. This is a moſt valuable portion of the work, as it completely unfolds Mr. Richardſon's own objects, views, and reaſons in this the moſt maſterly of his productions. In the courſe of the correſpondence the lady acknowledges her real name and rank. Theſe letters occupy more than the half of the fourth volume, and moſt intereſting and able compoſitions they are.

The fifth volume opens with a correſpondence between Mr. Richardſon and Lady Echlin, the ſiſter of Lady Bradſhaigh. The firſt ſubject of this correſpondence is an edition of Sir Charles Grandiſon, pirated by the Dublin bookſellers; and expreſſing the indignation of rectitude and integrity againſt ſuch a fraud. Lady Echlin alſo objected to the melancholy cataſtrophe of Clariſſa, and was ſeized with a

deſire

deſire of altering the ſtory to her own mind. The alterations and reaſons on the one hand, are the chief ſubjects of Lady Echlin's letters, while Richardſon courteouſly enters into ſome diſcuſſion leaſt he ſhould appear to think her unworthy of conteſt, and, without cruſhing her arguments at a blow, ſlips away from the conteſt. In theſe letters to the two ladies, it is obvious that Mr. Richardſon could write with all the politeneſs of a courtier, as well as the force and variety of a man of genius. Theſe different kinds of correſpondents call into action the great verſatility of Mr. Richardſon's powers. There are ſeveral letters between the hero and Hildſley, Lord Biſhop of Sodor and Man. The chief ſubjects of theſe are moral and pious publications, and the works of Mr. Richardſon, as conducive to morality and piety. In one of theſe letters the Biſhop aſks of Mr. Richardſon who Yorick is, and the anſwer contains a very ſevere criticiſm upon Triſtram Shandy. As this was a work that could not interfere with the fame of Richardſon's productions, we may fairly impute it to the author's conviction, eſpecially as he allows the excellencies while he blames the defects. While he cenſures incoherence and reprobates indecency, he admits both the wit and pathos. Letters between Mr. Loftus and Mr. Richardſon are partly upon the three novels; but beſides this often-repeated ſubject, contain various amuſing anecdotes of literary and faſhionable characters. Mr. Skelton, a clergyman of Dublin, and Mr. Richardſon, correſponded partly on the morality and religion of Richardſon's novels, and partly on moral and pious publications in general. Skelton himſelf, it ſeems, wanted to publiſh diſcourſes. Mr. Millar being applied to, did not rate them ſo highly as the author himſelf, and was unwilling to run any riſk. The author imputes this backwardneſs to the malignant depravity of the public taſte; and inſiſts that, if the books were deiſtical, it would have ſold three editions. At the cloſe of the correſpondence it is not clear whether the volumes in queſtion were publiſhed or not. Mr. Richardſon appears to have been the printer who was to have been employed, but we do not ſee whether it was actually printed. Mr. Stinſtra, a Dutch clergyman, tranſlated Clariſſa, and ſeveral letters paſſed between him and the author, both on the tranſlation and on various ſubjects of theology. From his correſpondence with different clergymen, we find Richardſon was well verſed in practical divinity. Mr. Defreval wrote ſeveral letters from Paris, which give a view of that metropolis about the year 1751, and alſo of the reception of Richardſon's works in that capital.

There now follow three letters from the higheſt literary and moral authority which the eighteenth century could bring forward. The voice of Dr. Johnſon confirms the judgment of the many other friends of truth, virtue, and religion, who have beſtowed high praiſes on the works of Richardſon.

A few other letters of leſs comparative intereſt are inſerted in the fifth volume, which cloſes with the hiſtory of Mrs. Beaumont.

Whether

Whether this be now a part of Sir Charles Grandiſon we do not recollect.

The ſixth volume conſiſts entirely of a correſpondence between Richardſon and Lady Bradſhaigh, and embraces a much greater variety of topics than any previous ſet of letters. It contains diſcuſſions on many ſubjects of the higheſt importance in the conduct of life, and which very fully develope the ſtores of Mr. Richardſon's mind. Literary ſubjects are alſo frequently introduced, and ſometimes topics of rather a political nature, although on ſuch Mr. Richardſon and his correſpondents very rarely entered. In ſome of her letters Lady Bradſhaigh ſeems rather to verge towards enthuſiaſm on certain theological ſubjects; ſhe diſplays, nevertheleſs, ſound ſenſe and rational piety on moſt ſubjects. A good deal of this correſpondence is upon Sir Charles Grandiſon, that was then making its appearance, and the lady reverts to her favourite topic Clariſſa. But this repetition is ſo mixed with ſubjects that are not repetitions, that the letters are amuſing and agreeable. One obſervation of Lady Bradſhaigh's ſhews what extravagant flattery Mr. Richardſon received. She aſſerts, that a paper, written in the Rambler by him, is ſuperior to any of the others written by Johnſon! One of Mr. Richardſon's letters, on the nuptials of a friend of theirs, contains a very excellent eſſay upon marriage, or rather the married ſtate. It is too long for quotation, and cannot, without injury, be abridged. The reader will find it in page 128. The ſubject introduces a diſcuſſion which will pleaſe and inſtruct the reader through ſeveral letters that follow. The diſſertation alſo includes filial obedience, on the obligations and extent of which the notions of Mr. Richardſon were very high. The correſpondence proceeds to debate the connection between the love we have for a being that we are bound to venerate, and obey, and fear. Lady Bradſhaigh is an advocate for the equality of the ſexes; and Mr. Richardſon claims a ſuperiority to the one. They ſupport their reſpective poſitions with great ingenuity, both from reaſon and ſcripture; but Richardſon, it muſt be confeſſed, with the ſounder arguments. The correſpondence with Lady Bradſhaigh concludes theſe letters; and to the work a conciſe and ſatisfactory index is annexed, which makes up the remainder of the ſixth volume.

The correſpondence of Samuel Richardſon is an agreeable and eſtimable acceſſion to literary biography. The life and character of the author from his letters is much more fully before the world than previous to this publication. His letters, like his novels, develop human nature, and promote virtue and rational piety. Beſides ſuch conſtituents of the moſt valuable inſtruction, they abound in amuſement and entertainment. They comprehend a great variety of anecdotes, and a much greater variety of characters. They ſhew us man both as he ought to be and as he is. The very foibles of Richardſon, which theſe letters occaſionally diſcover, render the picture much more natural, and conſequently more intereſting. While his genius, benevolence, and piety, place him above the rank of common men; his

his rivalry, his egotiſm, his vanity, and openneſs to flattery, exemplify the imperfection of human nature, and the weakneſſes that are to be found in the beſt and wiſeſt men. The world is indebted to the combined judgment and liberality of the proprietor and publiſher; and alſo to the diſcernment which ſelected an editor ſo peculiarly fitted for doing juſtice to the writings and character of Richardſon. Mrs. Barbauld has genius, taſte, and ſentiment more congenial to thoſe which have been diſplayed in Pamela, Grandiſon, and Clariſſa, than probably any writer of the times, even including thoſe of a ſimilar direction, if perhaps we ſhould except the author of Evelina and Cecilia.

Hill's *Synonymes of the Latin Language.*

(*Continued from Vol. XVIII. P.* 382.)

PREPOSITIONS, it is very generally agreed, were originally applied to expreſs the relations of objects in ſpace. Their meaning has been afterwards extended, by analogy, to ſignify the relations of events in time, and other relations of various kinds, of a character ſtill more abſtract and metaphyſical. When we examine, with attention, the different uſes of the ſame prepoſition, eſpecially when they mark relations in place, we find that theſe relations are chiefly modified by the idea of motion. Sometimes the relations are underſtood to be the effect of previous motion, at other times the conſideration of motion is altogether excluded: and the queſtion has been agitated among grammarians, whether, in the primitive application of the prepoſitions, it be eſſential to their character to give notice of previous motion or not. We are of opinion that the prepoſitions themſelves give no ſuch notice, though the words with which they may happen to be joined very frequently do. We think that, in denoting ſimple relations of place, their whole original force is ſeen, and that, whenever the conception of motion accompanies them, that circumſtance is ſuperadded, extraneous, and accidental. Dr. Hill, on the other hand, with regard to many of them, appears to conſider the idea of motion as neceſſarily included in their very firſt formation; and he ſeems to think, of courſe, that, wherever they occur diveſted of this idea, they have deviated from the characteriſtic nature of their claſs. The prepoſitions *a*, *ab*, and *abs*, he, accordingly thus explains:

"The primary notion, ſuggeſted by theſe three prepoſitions, is the ſame; that of the continually increaſing diſtance of a body in motion, in reſpect to a point from which that motion commenced. They regard not the cauſe of this ſtate, and are equally applicable to a body, that has the power of moving itſelf, and to one, that is impelled by ſomething external. *Till a change of place exists, they suggest nothing*; and, regarding the moving body only in reſpect to the point of outſet, they announce one of its relations, by governing the term which expreſſes that point." (P. 1.)

In illuſtration of this theory, Dr. Hill has two examples, both

ſrom Virgil. "*A* Troja ventoſa per æquora vectos." "Argiva phalanx inſtructis navibus ibat *a* Tenedo." In both theſe inſtances there is motion indeed; but it is not, in either caſe, ſuggeſted by *a*. The words denoting it are *vectos* and *ibat*. The prepoſition expreſſes merely *diſtance* or *interval*; and this may be contemplated with as much ſteadineſs and eaſe, when motion is not connected with it, as when it is. The correlative points which terminate diſtance are marked by *a* and *ad*. But "theſe *points*," our author himſelf acknowledges, "may be regarded as fixed in ſpace, and thus *become the meaſure of diſtance*, [we were not ſo taught at Cambridge,] between bodies that are quieſcent, the one of which lies in the eaſt, and the other in the weſt." (P. 2.) Though, here, the language of the learned Profeſſor is none of the moſt accurate, yet he evidently abandons his poſition, that the idea of motion is eſſential to theſe prepoſitions. That poſition, indeed, is completely overturned both by his example and by his commentary.

"Omnibus in terris quæ ſunt *a* Gadibus uſque
Auroram et Gangem." Juv. 10. 1.

"The poet here mentions a ſpace, extending from the weſt of Europe to the eaſtern parts of Aſia." He had ſaid before, our readers will remember, that till a change of place exiſts, *a*, *ab*, and *abs* ſuggeſt nothing. Yet, ſurely, they here ſuggeſt ſomething, though the countries which lie between Cadiz and the Ganges never changed their place. This example alone ought, we think, to have convinced Dr. Hill that motion does not enter into the original notion of theſe prepoſitions. He is not willing, however, to renounce this idea. "Though Juvenal," he ſays, "uſes the prepoſition *a*, *which originally denotes motion*, he does not ſay that this ſpace has been travelled over." But, in truth, the whole import of the prepoſition is accurately ſtated by himſelf in the following ſentence: "He," the poet, "merely ſuggeſts *an interval* between the iſland on the coaſt of Spain and the river in India."

But the learned author, ſtill conſidering motion as eſſential to the primitive notion of theſe prepoſitions, has a curious theory to account for their being employed in phraſes which give notice of *nearneſs*. "The progreſs of the moving body," he ſays, "is ſuppoſed to be ſoon ſtopped; and this gives exiſtence to proximity, in reſpect to the point of departure." This uſe of the prepoſitions he exemplifies by the expreſſions, "Tam prope *a* domo detineri;" and "proximus a poſtremo." It is odd that he ſhould here tranſfer the idea of proximity from *prope* and *proximus* to the prepoſition; and as to the fancy of the motions being ſoon ſtopped, it is altogether, in our apprehenſion, chimerical. Why may not the houſe in which a man lives be next to that at the end of the ſtreet, though it ſhould not be ſuppoſed to have taken a ramble before it fixed itſelf in that ſituation? Our author's commentary on the following ſentence of Cicero, we do not underſtand: "Pleræque epiſtolæ mihi nuntiabant ubi eſſes, quod erant *abs* te."

te." Epiſt. Attic. 4. 16. "If we abſtract," he tells us, "the notion of vicinity from the prepoſition, the above ſentence would be void of meaning." (P. 3.)

From the notion of vicinity, which our author finds in theſe prepoſitions, he explains ſeveral of their applications. Thus, with regard to the expreſſions *a cyathis*, *a pedibus*, *ab epiſtolis*, *eſſe*, for a *cup bearer*, a *footman*, a *ſecretary*, he ſays that the "departments of ſervants are announced and fixed by their being *near* thoſe places at which their ſervices are performed, ſo that they can promptly afford the aſſiſtance that is wanted." (P. 4.) But the conception here ſuggeſted is not that of *nearneſs*. It is, on the contrary, that of diſtance. And the inference drawn by the mind is, that the employment from which a perſon comes is that in which he is generally engaged. "The relation of cauſe and effect," it is likewiſe alleged by our author, "is underſtood to reſult from the nearneſs of bodies, one of which can, from this circumſtance, produce a change upon the other." (P. 3.) This is true when that relation is expreſſed by *ad*, but not when it is expreſſed by *a*. We wonder that our author ſhould have fixed upon this circuitous method of explanation, inſtead of the natural and direct one, of conſidering the effect as proceeding *from* the cauſe. "Occidit *a forti* (ſic Dii voluiſtis) Achille." OVID. The killing came *from* Achilles as its cauſe. Our author's comment on this expreſſion contains one of thoſe ſententious remarks in which his book abounds, and which he, doubtleſs, conſiders as full of wiſdom. We hope that our readers will diſcover its importance. "Had the rencounter never taken place, Achilles would not have been the efficient cauſe of his antagoniſt's death."

But of all the uſes of theſe prepoſitions, none is, by our author, more whimſically accounted for, than that which occurs in ſuch phraſes as this: "Quidvis, dum *ab* re nequid ores, faciam." PLAUT. "As the vicinity," ſays Dr. Hill, "of one body to another, from which it is diſtinct, is underſtood, in certain circumſtances, to be favourable to its beſt ſtate, ſo the removal of the adjunct from its principal is ſuppoſed to have a contrary effect. In order to explain this power, the prepoſitions muſt be regarded as ſuggeſting diſtance, or extent of interval. The principal is, in this uſe, expreſſed by 'res,' which repreſents a ſubſtance ſupporting certain qualities, one of which is ſuppoſed away from it, and thereby injuring the whole. The import of the above expreſſion of Plautus is thus brought out. "Hegio promiſes to do every thing deſired, provided Tyndarus aſked nothing injurious to a plan, the nature of which was underſtood. The fulfilment of the promiſe was to imply the ſeparation of no circumſtance, by the abſence of which its ſucceſs might be blaſted." (P. 6.) This is, ſurely, to travel ten thouſand miles in ſearch of what lies juſt under one's noſe. *Ab re*, in ſuch phraſes, means ſimply what is *diſtant* from the ſubject under conſideration; or, as we ſometimes expreſs it, "what is foreign from the purpoſe."

On what is ſaid by our author on the force of theſe prepoſitions, in

compoſition we have little to obſerve. We cannot, however, entirely paſs by his remarks on *amens* and *abſimilis*. "The firſt," he ſays, "denotes the privation of reaſon, which is eſſential to mind in a ſound ſtate. Varro ſuggeſts this idea in the definition of a perſon to whom 'amens' is applicable: 'Is qui *a* mente ſuâ diſceſſit.' We ſhould have agreed with the critic entirely, had he ſaid '*a* quo mens ſua diſceſſit,' and made the influence of the prepoſition act upon the object correlative to that, to which it is made an appendage. It is the departure of intellect which is the quality, from the perſon, which is the ſubſtance, that is ſuggeſted; not that of the perſon from intellect." (P. 10.) Yet, with all due reſpect to the learned Profeſſor, we think that Varro is right. It is as eaſy to conceive a perſon to depart from his mind as his mind from him. Our author (p. 274.) produces the following ſentence from Cicero, in which he thinks the application of *diſcedere* a ſingular one: "Is, magnitudine timoris, *a conſtantia*, atque *a mente*, atque *a ſeipſo* diſceſſit;" and he explains it thus: "A ſeparation is here ſaid to have taken place between a perſon and himſelf."

"*Absimilis*" Dr. Hill obſerves, "denotes the abſence of likeneſs, under the idea that this quality has ſeparated from a certain ſubſtance, in which, if it had continued, a preciſe ſimilitude would have taken place between it and another. 'Non *absimilis* Tiberio principi fuit.' SUET. *in Othone* 1. The reſemblance between Tiberius and Otho was ſo great, that many believed they ſtood in the relation of father and ſon. It is aſſerted that there was not one remove of that quality in Otho, as a copy, which formed his reſemblance to Tiberius, as a pattern, and from this their mutual likeneſs is inferred." (Ibid.)

This, if we underſtand it, is equivalent to ſaying, "*It is aſſerted that Otho was not unlike Tiberius, and from this their mutual likeneſs is inferred.*" We ſhall certainly rejoice if, in this, as in many other of our learned author's remarks, his readers, in general, ſhould be able to diſcover more important information than our plain underſtandings have had the fortune to perceive. "Were the ſtudent," Dr. Hill, in his preface, aſſures us, "to exerciſe his reaſon by ſuch diſcuſſions as thoſe that are here exemplified, that ſmall ſtock of learning, which feeds the vanity of the pedant, would ſink into the contempt [which] it deſerves. The *ableſt metaphyſician* would then take the rank to which he is entitled as a critic; and many a paſſage of the Roman claſſics would be found luminous and inſtructive, that now lies neglected, becauſe it is not underſtood." (Pref. p. xiv.) We cannot but feel our own inferiority, when we reflect on thoſe metaphyſical accompliſhments, by the poſſeſſion of which, in our author's opinion, high rank among critics is to be acquired.

The obſervations of the learned Profeſſor, on the other prepoſitions of the Latin language, our limits will not permit us to conſider with equal minuteneſs. Of *abſque* he ſays, "It differs from the prepoſition of which it is a compound, in having no reference to the departure of any object correlative to that, whoſe ſign it governs. It implies the

the abſence of what is looked for as inherent in the object, but which, *from not having exiſted*, can never have been removed. That which 'ſine' governs is in the ſtate of an accidental concomitant, not found at the time; but that which *abſque* governs *never could be the attendant of the correlative object*, elſe its nature would have been different from what it is." Thus our author writes (p. 20.) where he treats of *abſque*; but when he comes (pp. 701, 702.) to *ſine*, in the courſe of the alphabet, he favours us with the following diſtinctions. "SINE denotes the relation which one object bears to another, with which it is not, but may be, or may have been, accompanied. *Sine* differs from abſque, which denotes *the breach of an union underſtood to have taken place, and to be* ESSENTIAL *to the nature of the ſubjects united.* The former denotes caſual diſunion, not affecting the ſubjects ſeparated It does not ſuggeſt that any union had ever taken place, but only that it is poſſible it might have done ſo." To the reconciliation of theſe two paſſages the metaphyſical genius of the learned profeſſor may be perfectly competent; but, as our powers, in that way, are very circumſcribed, we ſhall be prudent enough not to commit ourſelves by making any ſuch attempt.

Our ingenious grammarian's obſervations on *ad* are full of deep philoſophy. Of this prepoſition he makes, of courſe, the radical meaning to be "the continually decreaſing diſtance of a moving body, from a point to which it tends, and at which its motion is to terminate." (P. 25.) "It may be obſerved," we afterwards learn, "that the object approached may be either animate or inanimate; but that that which approaches muſt either have life itſelf, or be directed by a being that has it." (P. 26.) Can any diſcovery be conceived more wonderful? "Before the commencement of motion," however, "*ad* can," it ſeems "ſuggeſt its future direction, and even ſuggeſts the aſpect of a body that cannot of itſelf move towards the point to which it is made to look." (P. 25.) Undoubtedly it can. "Simulacrum Victoriæ *ad* ſimulacrum Minervæ ſpectabat." CÆSAR. We therefore conclude that *motion* is not an eſſential ingredient in the notion of *ad*." But, the motion of a body," we are gravely told, "does not always terminate 'at' or 'by the ſide of' another, but ſometimes at *a* POINT *bounded by limits more or leſs extenſive.*" In illuſtration of this remark, we have a ſentence from Cicero; "Pecunia utinam *ad* eadem Opis maneret." What *motion* our author finds in this ſentence we do not clearly conceive. But what we chiefly wiſh to point out to our readers is, that the learned doctor is not leſs diſtinguiſhed by his accuracy in mathematics than in metaphyſics. He ſeems very fond of *points*; but his points are aſſuredly not the points of Euclid. In ſuch examples as the laſt, he informs us, the prepoſition *ad* is to be tranſlated *within*; and "this," he adds, "ſuppoſes *a certain latitude* given to *the point* where the motion terminates, which implies *its capacity or power of containing the body arriving.*" (P. 33.)

Of *ante* our author rightly ſays that it "denotes the relation borne by one object to another, before or in the front of which it lies." We

could pardon the nugatory obſervation that "it applies equally to objects, both animate and inanimate;" but what follows is too bad. "In the relation expreſſed by *ante*, *one or both the objects muſt be animate.*" Our author has given us two examples, from which, as he contends, it appears "that in one of the objects, at leaſt, connected with *ante*, there muſt be animation, and a conſciouſneſs of the oppoſition. One of theſe examples is the following:

> Iſthuc eſt ſapere, non *quod ante pedes* modo eſt
> Videre, ſed etiam illa quæ futura ſunt
> Proſpicere.———————— TER.

Now here, as we could not ſuppoſe the animation and conſciouſneſs to be in *quod*, we were inclined to think that, in the profeſſor's opinion, they reſided in *the feet*. Unfortunately, however, he oppoſes this example to the following: Ante *pedes* veſtros, *ante* oculos, judices cædes futuræ ſunt." Cicero, *pro S. Roſe*, 20. The fact, he ſays, that one of the objects muſt be animated and conſcious, appears in this example, "*though*, in it, the animation is in the governed, not in the correlative object." It follows, of neceſſity, that in the quotation from Terence, the animation and conſciouſneſs are not in the *feet*. We cannot yet think that they belong to *quod*. We are therefore reduced to the diſmal neceſſity of imagining that the profeſſor applied them to the *perſon* who had *wiſdom*, *ſight*, and *foreſight*; and hat conſequently, according to the profeſſor's philoſophy, the local ſituation of a man may be *before his feet*. But we are aſhamed of this trifling. We venture to ſay that *animation* and *conſciouſneſs* have no connection with *ante*; and that Columæla is unjuſtly cenſured by Dr. Hill, as "guilty of impurity," for ſaying "*Ante* ſtabulum nullæ anguſtiæ ſint." (Pp. 93, 94.) We have not room to conſider his obſervations on *apud*.

The next prepoſitions are *circa* and *circum*, with regard to which we ſhould have thought it impoſſible to exhibit a diſplay of metaphyſical ſubtelty. But, as Stella ſaid, of Swift, that he could write finely on a broomſtick, ſo we may ſay of Dr. Hill, that he can write, or rather, that he affects to write, metaphyſically on every ſubject.

"As 'inter' requires more than one governed, ſo *circa* and *circum* require more than one correlative object. Any number of governed, more than one, ſuits the former. When that number is but two, 'inter' is tranſlated 'between;' and when *it* is any above *it*, *it* is tranſlated 'among.' *If three bodies lie in a ſtraight line, the extreme ones are not in the relation of circa or circum, in reſpect to the middle one*, whether they be equidiſtant from it or not. In order to give exiſtence to this relation, it is underſtood that more than two points equidiſtant from one in the midſt of them, muſt be occupied, and there is no poſſible limitation of their number, till, by their junction, they form one unbroken circumference. But a number of objects may be ſurrounded, as well as a ſingle one; and this plurality *only forms* [forms only] *an extenſion of the central point* [this *extenſion* of the central *point* is admirable] and requires

requires the ſame conditions in reſpect to the ſituation of the exterior objects, as a ſingle one. (Pp. 184, 185.)

How the learned profeſſor ſhould have perſuaded himſelf that either men or boys could be inſtructed by pages of ſuch pompous inanity as this, it is altogether impoſſible for us to conjecture. Let us turn, however, to *inter*, and obſerve how it is treated of in its own place.

"INTER holds of 'in' as its root, and, being rendered indefinite, from being compounded, *expresses imperfect inclosure.* It expreſſes that relation which *one* or *more* objects *bear*, [this conſtruction is ungrammatical] to a number that are on different ſides of *them.* The difference between *circa* and *inter* has been explained at length. The former intimates that the central body occupies a particular point in reſpect to thoſe, by which it may be partly or entirely ſurrounded; the latter denotes, that the correlative *body* or bodies do [ungrammatical again] not form the extremities of three, or of any greater number." (P. 455.)

This paragraph furniſhes, we really think, as complete an inſtance of the waſte of words as it is poſſible to deſire. But what does Dr. Hill mean by ſaying that *inter* expreſſes *imperfect incloſure?* Let us hear him a little farther. "*Inter*, in its radical meaning, denotes 'between' and 'among.' It denotes the former, when the interjacent object lies *in a line that is direct*, or nearly ſo, between two, not neceſſarily equally diſtant from it." Does Dr. Hill call this *imperfect incloſure?* "It denotes the latter when the correlative object is not at the extremity of a group, the conſtituents of which may lie at different diſtances, and muſt lie in different directions from itſelf." Of this profound ſentence we are far from being ſure that we comprehend the ſenſe; but the learned doctor *ſeems* to ſay that when all the letters of the alphabet are arranged *in the ſame ſtraight line*, the middle ones cannot be *among* them.

Our author ſeems puzzled by the repetition of *inter* in ſuch ſentences as theſe. "Ut nihil *inter* te atque *inter* quadrupedem aliquam putes intereſſe," CIC. "Neſtor componere lites *inter* Peliden feſtinat et *inter* Atriden." HOR. It may be regarded, he thinks, as an authorized pleonaſm; but we have not been accuſtomed to conſider it as ſuch. *Inter*, we conceive, to be a comparative from *in*, as *præter* is from *præ*, and *ſubter* from *ſub.* If ſo, it ſignifies *farther in*, or *on the inſide of*; and the double uſe of it is perfectly correct. Thus:

Neſtor

Pelides————|————Atrides.

If we take our meaſurement from the oppoſite points at which Achilles and Agammemnon ſtand, Neſtor is on the inſide of one, *and alſo* on the inſide of the other.

(To be continued.)

An Inquiry into the preſent ſtate of the Military Force of the Britiſh Empire, with a view to its re-organization. Addreſſed to the Right Honourable William Pitt. By Lieutenant-Colonel R. T. Wilſon, K. M. T. 8vo. Pp. 106. Egerton, London. 1804.

WE mean no diſreſpect to Sir Robert Wilſon as a brave and good officer, when we apply to the work before us the words formerly applied to a criticiſing cobler: "Ne ſutor ultra crepedam." That Sir Robert is fully competent to "ſet a ſquadron in the field," and afterwards lead it gallantly into action, we firmly believe; but we do not believe him capable of directing or comprehending the whole ſyſtem of the military arrangement of the Britiſh empire, taking it in all its parts, both as to its active energy in oppoſing the enemy, or its internal organization with regard to the habits, the prejudices, and above all, the peculiar conſtitution of the country. Our belief, and our unbelief, are equally built on experience; that he is a brave and intelligent officer of cavalry, has been ſhewn by his conduct in the field; and that he has not that comprehenſive mind that can authoriſe him to cenſure and amend the whole military eſtabliſhment of the country, is as clearly ſhewn in the pages we are now examining.

The author conſiders our military eſtabliſhments in the following order: The volunteers, militia, army of reſerve, regular army, and the guards; the diſtinction of the two laſt is not very flattering to the gentlemen of the guards; and it is rather extraordinary that an officer of cavalry ſhould not have a particular diviſion appropriated to the conſideration of that very eſſential part of our army, eſpecially as in the courſe of the pamphlet he ſeems by no means deficient in a partiality for it, ſo natural to a perſon who has diſtinguiſhed himſelf in that ſervice.

Very early in the work we find a ſingular inſtance of the author's candour with reſpect to the volunteers; after aſking whether, if the ſafe paſſage of the channel could be ſecured, France would heſitate to diſembark her armies with the conſciouſneſs of 500,000 volunteers enrolled in Great Britain, and all the terrible conſequences of defeat, he triumphantly adds, "Fortunately government does not entertain a too confident opinion of the invincibility of the force collected for the defence of the empire, as our perſevering blockade for ſo many months evinces." Now, in the firſt place, we are not decidedly inclined to give that anſwer to his queſtion, which he ſeems to take for granted muſt be given. We have ſtrong doubts, if the French would, in the poſture we now are, contemptible as it may appear to Sir Robert Wilſon, attempt to invade us, even if the paſſage of the channel were ſafe; and the ſecond obſervation does not deſerve a ſerious anſwer; would the beſt appointed and beſt manned ſhip in the Britiſh navy forego the advantage of her batteries, and permit the enemy to board? or what is nearer the point in queſtion, would the braveſt garriſon diſmantle the guns of a fortified town, and, in overweening

confidence

confidence of their own courage and numbers, expoſe the inhabitants to all the horrors of a ſtorm. If the 500,000 volunteers were veteran ſoldiers, equal to the heroes of Minden, the miniſter who, truſting to the decided ſuperiority of ſuch a force, to any force the invaders could bring, were for a moment to relax our naval defence, to anticipate (uſing the author's own words in another place) "the ſtrange and fearful times, when Engliſhmen (read Britons) muſt *conteſt* on Britiſh ground for the future poſſeſſion of the ſoil, when this ſhall be the arena on which Buonaparté, if he lives, will combat for the empire of the world" Perhaps *ſuch* an argument would be better anſwered by theſe lines in Bramſton's Art of Politics:

"I hear a lion in the lobby roar,
Say, Mr. Speaker, ſhall we ſhut the door,
And keep him there, or ſhall we let him in,
To try if we can turn him out again?"

The author's opinion of what the volunteers *can*, and what they *cannot*, do to annoy the enemy, is ſo diametrically oppoſite to every thing that muſt ſtrike a perſon at all converſant with military affairs that one ſhould be tempted to wonder how it could come from the pen of a perſon who has ſeen ſo much active ſervice as Sir Robert Wilſon has, indeed it is contradictory to itſelf in ſome inſtances. He firſt ſays,

"If the French were once to entrench, there can be no doubt but the volunteers might, and would then diſplay their courage with certain proſpect of victory; but armed peaſants, under a proper diſpoſition, and with ſupport from the regular army, would aſſault, with the ſame gallantry, and almoſt equal probability of carrying the lines. A forward movement of that nature is different from field operations. Energy, not order, would be required from the maſs, and the conteſt, hand to hand afterwards, would, on every account, be in favour of the aſſailants."

He then proceeds to ſhew the diſadvantages the volunteers will be under from deficiency in diſcipline, and want of confidence in their officers, and adds,

"Many, unacquainted with the operations of war, preſume that the uſe of the truly Britiſh weapon 'the bayonet,' would compenſate for this deficiency, and imagine that the *inclination* to engage in cloſe action enſures the *opportunity*. Perhaps I may fail in correcting this opinion, but nevertheleſs the idea is altogether erroneous. An able and active enemy will, in an incloſed country, mock ſuch an attempt, and in ſecurity mow down the hordes of aſſailants. The invention of gun-powder has facilitated the enterpriſe of invaders, by elongating the otherwiſe overbearing weight of numbers; and unleſs the French, deſpiſing the advantage of ground, and raſhly confident in preſumed ſuperiority of ſkill, venture upon Saliſbury plain, or ſome other particular open tract, it can only be after the moſt frightful loſs (indeed too frightful for the beſt troops) that the intrepid ſurvivors reach their ranks."

Here we are told in one breath that armed peaſants are equal to regular forces in attacking entrenched lines, and in another, that to attack

tack the common fences of an incloſed country they are not equal; but if the French were to chuſe a tract of open country, like Saliſbury plain, then the volunteers would have the advantage from the uſe they might make of the bayonet.

Nothing can be leſs probable than that the invading army ſhould think of entrenching, or protecting themſelves by incloſures: delay muſt be fatal, as they cannot look for reinforcements from France, while we continue the *inglorious* ſyſtem of blockade; they will try to puſh forward to the metropolis, and the great obſtacle to this will be the ſtrong incloſed country through which they muſt paſs, not attacked, but defended by the volunteers, according to the very judicious ſyſtem of Colonel Hanger. The enemy would certainly prefer an open country, though perhaps the obſtacles they would meet there would be little leſs formidable, but the danger they would encounter would not ariſe from the deſultory attacks of the volunteers with the bayonet, but from the ſteady oppoſition of our regular army, and we will venture to add our militia, our horſe-artillery, and our numerous cavalry, who would attack their line of march in every direction; to atack if they advanced they would be cut to pieces, and if they halted they would be ſtarved.

We have dwelt longer on the volunteers than we ſhall on any other part of the work, becauſe the ſubject has of late much engaged the public mind, and the attention paid to it by the enlightened and patriotic miniſter, to whom the pamphlet before us is addreſſed, has been the cauſe of much undeſerved obloquy; and yet, before we quit it, we muſt advert to the following note:

"A nobleman, to whoſe opinion the higheſt deference muſt be paid, has, it is ſtated, declared, that he conſiders the volunteers of Scotland as equal to the defence of that part of the empire. The Scotch are certainly a very warlike people, and the poverty of the country is unfavourable to the progreſs of an enemy; but notwithſtanding thoſe advantages, the ability of the commander, and the heroic exertions which he will make, ſtill, if a conſiderable force ſhould land, ſuch a triumph muſt at leaſt be conſidered as one of thoſe extraordinary inſtances which ſometimes occur, to prove that military theory does not always rule events."

On this point, however unwilling we are to make any illiberal or perſonal remark, we muſt ſay, it is no ſmall ſketch of ſelf opinion in an officer, whoſe command has been confined to a ſquadron of light dragoons, to ſet his judgment againſt that of the general who led an army through an enemy's country to the relief of the Duke of York; and we are tempted to apply to him on this occaſion the words uſed on another by the celebrated German critic, Leſſing. "It is not impoſſible that *one* may for *once only* have judged better than the *other*, but on the bare poſſibility it is what I would not believe in any caſe."

Some of the obſervations on the militia are very judicious, and certainly the author is right in ſaying it has deviated from the firſt principle on which it was created; but it was not, as he ſays, originally raiſed as a counterpoiſe to the ſtanding army, it was firſt raiſed at a time

time when the alarm of invaſion was almoſt as great as at the preſent moment. The regular army was at that time conquering the enemy in every part of the world. Mr. Pitt was too proud a Briton to recur, as his predeceſſors in office had, to the unpopular and diſgraceful meaſure of introducing foreign mercenaries; to recruit the army, ſo as to raiſe any thing like a ſufficient force for the emergency, was impoſſible; he had recourſe then to the militia as the only mean to excite a general military ſpirit in the nation, which muſt have been miſerably depreſſed, when only a few years before five thouſand half-armed and half-naked mountaineers ſeriouſly threatened the exiſtence of the government. But the idea of Mr. Pitt was that the ranks ſhould be filled with the yeomanry, and commanded by the nobility and gentry of the country; nor did he conceive that the indulgence of ſubſtitution for individual convenience would ever be adopted, to much as it is, as a general principle. We believe at preſent there are not five hundred principals ſerving in the whole militia of England. On the original idea, hardly one man would ſerve who would ever have thought of going as a private into the regular army; at preſent, hardly one ſerves who is not taken from that claſs from which the regular army is recruited. No man, however, who regards the militia with the eye of an unprejudiced ſoldier, will heſitate to ſay that many of the regiments are in a high ſtate of diſcipline, and as likely to do their duty in every reſpect as any troops that have never ſeen actual ſervice.

The following aſſertion we read with ſome degree of ſurpriſe: "The Guards are certainly the beſt troops in the world to beſiege a town, which, however, rarely happens in their ſervice, becauſe they are accuſtomed to hard work, can dig more rapidly, and carry heavier burthens than moſt other ſoldiers." This, we think, might have been better applied to the militia and the provincial volunteers, who are certainly more accuſtomed, at leaſt, to hard work, and to dig, than thoſe of the Guards, who occaſionally act as duſt-men and coal-heavers.

What the author ſays of engaging ſoldiers for limited ſervice we think unanſwerable; and it is impoſſible for us to expreſs the approbation we feel of his manly and humane cenſure of the diſgraceful puniſhments that are but too frequent and too ſevere in the army.

Sir Robert Wilſon certainly paſſes too high a panegyric on Captain James as a writer, and on Mr. Cobbet as a patriot, and his companion of the Carthagenian army at the battle of Zama with our deference, is childiſh in the extreme, and ſhews him incapable of diſtinguiſhing between the different characters of the people of Carthage and Britain. How many natives of the territory of Carthage does he ſuppoſe compoſed the veteran army of Hannibal at the battle of Zama, or who had croſſed the Alps and triumphed with him at Cannæ and Thraſymene.

By way of encouraging his countrymen in theſe *ſtrange and fearful times*, as the author calls them, he conjures up the old bug-bear of the Norman conqueſt, and reminds "us that England has been conquered

tack the common fences of an incloſed country they are not equal; but if the French were to chuſe a tract of open country, like Saliſbury plain, then the volunteers would have the advantage from the uſe they might make of the bayonet.

Nothing can be leſs probable than that the invading army ſhould think of entrenching, or protecting themſelves by incloſures: delay muſt be fatal, as they cannot look for reinforcements from France, while we continue the *inglorious* ſyſtem of blockade; they will try to puſh forward to the metropolis, and the great obſtacle to this will be the ſtrong incloſed country through which they muſt paſs, not attacked, but defended by the volunteers, according to the very judicious ſyſtem of Colonel Hanger. The enemy would certainly prefer an open country, though perhaps the obſtacles they would meet there would be little leſs formidable, but the danger they would encounter would not ariſe from the deſultory attacks of the volunteers with the bayonet, but from the ſteady oppoſition of our regular army, and we will venture to add our militia, our horſe-artillery, and our numerous cavalry, who would attack their line of march in every direction; to atack if they advanced they would be cut to pieces, and if they halted they would be ſtarved.

We have dwelt longer on the volunteers than we ſhall on any other part of the work, becauſe the ſubject has of late much engaged the public mind, and the attention paid to it by the enlightened and patriotic miniſter, to whom the pamphlet before us is addreſſed, has been the cauſe of much undeſerved obloquy; and yet, before we quit it, we muſt advert to the following note:

"A nobleman, to whoſe opinion the higheſt deference muſt be paid, has, it is ſtated, declared, that he conſiders the volunteers of Scotland as equal to the defence of that part of the empire. The Scotch are certainly a very warlike people, and the poverty of the country is unfavourable to the progreſs of an enemy; but notwithſtanding thoſe advantages, the ability of the commander, and the heroic exertions which he will make, ſtill, if a conſiderable force ſhould land, ſuch a triumph muſt at leaſt be conſidered as one of thoſe extraordinary inſtances which ſometimes occur, to prove that military theory does not always rule events."

On this point, however unwilling we are to make any illiberal or perſonal remark, we muſt ſay, it is no ſmall ſketch of ſelf opinion in an officer, whoſe command has been confined to a ſquadron of light dragoons, to ſet his judgment againſt that of the general who led an army through an enemy's country to the relief of the Duke of York; and we are tempted to apply to him on this occaſion the words uſed on another by the celebrated German critic, Leſſing. "It is not impoſſible that *one* may for *once only* have judged better than the *other*, but on the bare poſſibility it is what I would not believe in any caſe."

Some of the obſervations on the militia are very judicious, and certainly the author is right in ſaying it has deviated from the firſt principle on which it was created; but it was not, as he ſays, originally raiſed as a counterpoiſe to the ſtanding army, it was firſt raiſed at a time

time when the alarm of invaſion was almoſt as great as at the preſent moment. The regular army was at that time conquering the enemy in every part of the world. Mr. Pitt was too proud a Briton to recur, as his predeceſſors in office had, to the unpopular and diſgraceful meaſure of introducing foreign mercenaries; to recruit the army, ſo as to raiſe any thing like a ſufficient force for the emergency, was impoſſible; he had recourſe then to the militia as the only mean to excite a general military ſpirit in the nation, which muſt have been miſerably depreſſed, when only a few years before five thouſand half-armed and half-naked mountaineers ſeriouſly threatened the exiſtence of the government. But the idea of Mr. Pitt was that the ranks ſhould be filled with the yeomanry, and commanded by the nobility and gentry of the country; nor did he conceive that the indulgence of ſubſtitution for individual convenience would ever be adopted, to much as it is, as a general principle. We believe at preſent there are not five hundred principals ſerving in the whole militia of England. On the original idea, hardly one man would ſerve who would ever have thought of going as a private into the regular army; at preſent, hardly one ſerves who is not taken from that claſs from which the regular army is recruited. No man, however, who regards the militia with the eye of an unprejudiced ſoldier, will heſitate to ſay that many of the regiments are in a high ſtate of diſcipline, and as likely to do their duty in every reſpect as any troops that have never ſeen actual ſervice.

The following aſſertion we read with ſome degree of ſurpriſe: "The Guards are certainly the beſt troops in the world to beſiege a town, which, however, rarely happens in their ſervice, becauſe they are accuſtomed to hard work, can dig more rapidly, and carry heavier burthens than moſt other ſoldiers." This, we think, might have been better applied to the militia and the provincial volunteers, who are certainly more accuſtomed, at leaſt, to hard work, and to dig, than thoſe of the Guards, who occaſionally act as duſt-men and coal-heavers.

What the author ſays of engaging ſoldiers for limited ſervice we think unanſwerable; and it is impoſſible for us to expreſs the approbation we feel of his manly and humane cenſure of the diſgraceful puniſhments that are but too frequent and too ſevere in the army.

Sir Robert Wilſon certainly paſſes too high a panegyric on Captain James as a writer, and on Mr. Cobbet as a patriot, and his companion of the Carthagenian army at the battle of Zama with our deference, is childiſh in the extreme, and ſhews him incapable of diſtinguiſhing between the different characters of the people of Carthage and Britain. How many natives of the territory of Carthage does he ſuppoſe compoſed the veteran army of Hannibal at the battle of Zama, or who had croſſed the Alps and triumphed with him at Cannæ and Thraſymene.

By way of encouraging his countrymen in theſe *ſtrange and fearful times*, as the author calls them, he conjures up the old bug-bear of the Norman conqueſt, and reminds "us that England has been conquered

quered by a foreign army, though an heroic king headed a more numerous body of equally brave men." Is Sir Robert Wilſon ſo ignorant of the hiſtory of his country, as not to know that Harold had no more right to the crown of England than Buonaparté has to that of France; that like Buonaparté he had waded to empire through the blood of the royal family; that at the time of the battle of Haſtings the rightful heir to the crown was his captive; that he commanded a diſaffected army, mouldering away every hour by deſertion; and that he had no party attached to him from Northumberland to the Land's End, except thoſe who were his legal vaſſals, as Earl of Kent? Can* any one, for a moment, ſuppoſe that the fate of England could be decided by a ſingle battle on the coaſt of Suſſex, if the whole kingdom had not been diſſatisfied with the government? In thoſe times there was no enormous metropolis, that, like a morbid excreſcence, drains the vital juices of the nation, and yet whoſe amputation would be fatal.

We have perhaps dwelt longer on this pamphlet than either its ſize or its merit may ſeem to authoriſe; but to depreſs the ſpirit of the nation, and deprecate the means of its defence by falſe or exaggerated terror, is a matter of no trivial concern.

As literary critics, we have little to ſay of the merits of this pamphlet; the ſtyle is in general ſimple, and the conſtruction correct, but we muſt give our decided diſapprobation of the frequent uſe of French phraſes; and the coinage of ſuch a word as *appaying* is a ſolecism that deſerves our ſevereſt reprehenſion.

The Grampians deſolate: a Poem. By Alexander Campbell. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 320. Vernor and Hood. 1804.

MR. CAMPBELL is a writer not unknown to the public. In our Number for July 1802, we bore a favourable teſtimony to the merits of his tour through the centrical parts of Scotland. In that performance he touched upon the frontiers of the Grampians, but without entering into the heart of the mountainous tract. He incidentally mentioned the depopulation of certain diſtricts, from the rapid and great increaſe of ſheep-farms; eſpecially on the eſtates of his name-ſake, the Earl of Bredalbane. Mr. Campbell ſomewhat haſtily concluded that the decreaſe of population in particular ſpots was an evidence of the general depopulation of a country. This inference, however, is by no means unqueſtionable. As manufactures increaſe villages are formed, which drain the hamlets and cottages, and make a pariſh, or part of a pariſh, appear deſolate, while the whole county

* Were it not foreign to the general ſubject of this Review, we could ſhew ſtrong points of coincidence between the acceſſion of William I. and William III. REVIEWER.

is much better peopled; becauſe a greater maſs of productive induſtry provides in a much greater quantity, the means of raiſing and ſupporting families. In the weſtern parts of Scotland manufactures have increaſed within theſe twenty years in a very great proportion. The counties of Lanark, Renfrew, Dumbarton, Stirling, and other lowland parts, not far from the Highlands, have advanced more in ſedentary induſtry than in moſt other quarters of Scotland. Theſe require a great number of additional hands, and derive their chief imported ſupplies of labourers from the populous diſtricts of the adjacent Highlands of Weſtern Perthſhire and Argyleſhire. Great numbers have removed from thoſe parts of the Grampians to Paiſley, Kilmarnock, Dumbarton, &c. but far beyond all, to Glaſgow. Hence many of the glens of the Grampians, which heretofore teemed with men, have now a deſolate appearance. Beſide the temptations held out to young peaſants to quit their native hamlets, they are farther impelled, by the policy of ſome of their landlords, who, finding ſheep-farms produce much greater rents than corn-farms on ſuch lands, have turned a great quantity of ground into paſturage inſtead of agriculture; and therefore on their eſtates have many ſheep and but few men. Our author conceiving that the perſons who have been thus ejected generally migrate to America, deplores the hardſhips which the individuals thereby ſuffer, and regrets the loſs which muſt accrue to the country. The object of his poem is to proſcribe the immenſe extenſion of ſheep-farming as the cauſe of depopulation. The author propoſes to rouſe the public and the legiſlature to notice that ſyſtem of employing eſtates. As Mr. Campbell profeſſes to conſider the ſubject not only as a poet, but a political economiſt, the critic muſt not only view the beauty, ſublimity, force, or pathos of the fiction, but inveſtigate the ſtatements and reaſonings of the diſſertation.

The poem begins with an invocation to the muſe, "to whom the tales of other times belong," (the muſe of Oſſian.) The epic deſcription opens with a view of the Grampians deſolate, and a contraſt between the former and preſent ſtate of the Highlands. Our poet proceeds to ſing of ſheep-ſtores as the chief cauſes of depopulation. From the prevalence of that kind of rural economy, our army and navy will want the uſual ſupply of hardy and vigorous men. The Highlanders, or as he calls them, the Gaels, driven from their tenements, are either forced to emigrate to America, or to betake themſelves to towns or cities, and are thereby enervated; their morals are ſubverted, and eventually they are entirely ruined. He patriotically and ſtrongly exhorts the Highlanders not to be deluded by the proſpects held out by agents of the United States. He recommends that they ſhould truſt for redreſs of their evils to the Britiſh ſenate, which will no doubt adopt the beſt ſchemes that circumſtances may require; and he preſents a ſhort ſketch of the Highlanders, from what he terms the heroic ages, to the abolition of heritable juriſdictions in 1748. That meaſure was neceſſary to confirm and conſolidate the advantages of the union through both; the Highlands are of very high importance to the community,

munity, and, therefore, ought to be protected. The ſheep-farms he regards as very injurious to that part of the country in their preſent extent; and, therefore, infers that they ought to be limited. About one half of the volume conſiſts of notes: thoſe to the laſt part of the firſt book contain an account of the moſt eminent living characters which the Highlands have produced. Among theſe are Meſſrs. Macintoſh, Macleod, Macpherſon, and Garrow*, Sir William Grant, the Lord Chief Baron Macdonald, Doctors Fergusſon and Biſſet†. The enumeration omits ſome men of conſiderable eminence from the ſame neighbourhood, eſpecially Colonel Alexander Stewart, who ſo much diſtinguiſhed himſelf in Egypt, and Dr. William Thomſon, who was born at the very borders of the Grampians. He mentions a Mr. Macfarlane: we recollect no perſon of that name who has attained any diſtinction among men of talents. Our author repreſents the country among the Grampians to be now depopulated through ſheep-farms. The writer of this article happens to be locally acquainted with a conſiderable part of the tracts deſcribed, and is in general enabled to obſerve, that very little land is converted principally to ſheep-paſture, except in ſuch elevated ſituations as would not admit of extenſive corn-farms. In the vallies of the Grampians, and particularly in the two largeſt that are to be found among theſe mountains, along the banks of the Tay, from the loch at Taymouth, on both ſides of the river, to Dunkeld, and the other valley, along the banks of two tributary rivers of the Tay, from Blair to Dunkeld, agriculture is exerciſed with as much ſkill and ſucceſs as in moſt parts of England. Theſe diſtricts are remarkably populous. In the higher grounds of Bredalbane ſheep-farms are chiefly regarded, becauſe the ſoil and climate are fitter for ſheep than for corn. On Lord Bredalbane's eſtate, which has been chiefly noticed for its population, there is a conſiderable number of new villages, or of hamlets converted into villages, as any perſon may be convinced, who ſhall travel from Loch Tay along the right banks of the river, as far as his Lordſhip's eſtate extends. His neighbour, the Duke of Athol, has, within about thirty years, more than doubled the villages on his eſtate, among and adjoining the Grampians; and the lands of leſs extenſive proprietors have riſen in a ſimilar proportion of buildings and people. Our poet appears to us, on the whole, wrong as to his ſtatements reſpecting ſheep farms. We do not recollect great tracts of grounds ſo employed, unleſs in glens and ſuch other ſituations as are little fitted for agriculture. Tillage occupies its full ſhare of the farms among all the Perthſhire

---

* This cannot be Mr. Garrow the counſellor, as he is a native of either Middleſex or Hertfordſhire, having been born near Barnet.

† Both theſe gentlemen, whoſe reſpective hiſtories of Ancient Rome, and Modern Britain, have received the high praiſe of this Review, were born in the ſame houſe, being the ſons of two ſucceſſive miniſters of the ſame pariſh of Logierait in Perthſhire, of whom Mr. Fergusſon died in 1754, and Dr. Thomas Biſſet in 1800.

Grampians. The paſtural department of thoſe mountains, and the interjacent plains and hollows is perhaps too excluſively devoted to ſheep in that quarter of the Grampians, whereas black cattle are rather neglected. But in the more northern parts of that immenſe ridge this defect is ſupplied. The Grampians of Inverneſsſhire ſend vaſt numbers of cattle annually to England. The author's obſervation, that the removal of Highlanders from the country into cities enervates the race, and deprives the army and navy of a great ſource of men, is by no means ſupported by facts. Three out of four Highlanders, who enliſt as ſoldiers, enter the army not from hamlets, but from cities. Scarcely one becomes a King's ſailor without having been a mariner in the merchant's ſervice; and conſequently ſojourned in towns inſtead of the country. The fundamental poſitions of our author are evidently erroneous as ſtatements, and inconcluſive as reaſonings. With reſpect to the poetry it is not deficient in deſcriptive force, but wants harmony.

The firſt book we have treated more in detail than we ſhall handle the reſt, becauſe it contains the eſſence of the whole. The firſt furniſhes the text, on which the others are little more than comments. The ſecond deſcribes the manners of the Grampians before the alleged deſolation. Our poet appears to be the advocate of chieftainſhip, and ſeems to think that virtue fled from the Grampians with the heritable juriſdictions. This is a very different account from that which is commonly given. Many obſervers of the manners of the Highlanders repreſent theft and rapine as prevalent during the predominance of chieftainſhip; induſtry and good order are the effects of the extenſion of law and the bleſſings of the Britiſh conſtitution through thoſe lately barbarous regions. Since the introduction of ſheep-farms, veniſon and wild fowl are more ſcarce. But our poet juſtly obſerves, that if no greater evils accrued from ſheep than the diminution of roebucks and grouſe, *the evil, great as it is, might ſtill be tolerated.* But in driving men from the country, he contends that ſheep-farms do more miſchief than driving away either deer or moor game.

Deriving emigration from ſheep, he follows emigrants to the various ſcenes of their emigration. By ſheep are many adventurers driven to India, there they make fortunes, return as they went, ignorant upſtarts, and render themſelves ridiculous by their vanity, and pernicious by their luxury. We admit that there are among Eaſt India adventurers perſons of the kind that he deſcribes; but we cannot altogether ſee, how poor ſheep are to anſwer for either the follies or vices of Highland nabobs. *Quid feciſtis oves.* Our poet apoſtrophiſes to the diſcovery of America and the Eaſt Indies, and repeats the well-known names of Columbus, Gama, and other voyagers; but on that ſubject it is not likely he can introduce much novelty. Returning from Cortez and Pizarro to the Grampian ſheep, he obſerves, and we doubt not, very truly, that ſheep often periſh in the ſnow. Landlords who ſpend their rents upon their eſtates, and improve the country, are more beneficial than thoſe who conſume their incomes in

idleneſs

idleneſs and debauchery at a diſtance from home. Theſe remarks and diſcoveries enable us to clear the third book.

The fourth opens with a fine ſimile; not altogether new, repreſenting proſperity after adverſity, like ſunſhine after the darkneſs of night. He proceeds to an obſervation, which, though daily uſed, is ſtill not much the worſe for the wear, that moderate competence, peace, and health, are better than immenſe riches without theſe bleſſings. The exalted pleaſures of the underſtanding are the higheſt which mankind can enjoy. Bacon and Newton were very great philoſophers, and our poet ſeems to think it would be a great pleaſure to accompany them in their ſublimity. There is ſuch a fable as the tortoiſe which had a mind to accompany the ſoarings of the eagle. Part of this book is devoted to what our author calls the Georgics of the Grampians; and contains ſome very paſſable obſervations upon black cattle. The cow-boy is apt to become enamoured of the milk-maid. In time they marry, and have a ſmiling offſpring. Their children they regard with ſtill greater tenderneſs than the calves. If you give calves plenty of milk, that is the way to make them fat and ſtrong. We do not know a work that appears to have ſerved more as a model to many very voluminous writers of the preſent book-making generation of authors, than Swift's tritical eſſay on the faculties of the human mind, which very happily exhibits the art of ſtringing truiſms, and repeating what every one knows. From feeding calves our poet proceeds to a viſion of the genius of the Highlands, who appears to a hunter in a dream, to inform him of what he probably might have known before. The following is the ſubſtance of the communications:

"The royal ſeat of Scottiſh kings was once Dunſtafnage. Thence it was moved to Scone. Edward the Firſt conquered a great part of Scotland. This hiſtorical fact our author explains in a very long note, including the prophecy about the ſtone. Bruce roſe up in defence of Scotland, and afterwards came the race of the Stuarts." If the ſaid genius had made the hunter a preſent of Guthrie's Grammar, among the revolutions and memorable events, he would find all the atchievements here mentioned faithfully recorded. The viſion, however, adds prophecy to hiſtory, and ſtates to the hunter that the golden age is ſoon to revive among the Grampians. Delighted with this joyful news, the hearer of the good tidings drinks very heartily of Highland whiſkey, and with theſe potations the fourth book concludes.

The fifth opens with an account of the effects of extreme drought on the face of nature. It parches vegetation; but refreſhing ſhowers give an agreeable appearance to the country. In July they ſhear their ſheep; in Auguſt wean their lambs; in September they cut down their corn; and here there is a deſcription of reaping, which the poet informs us is ludicrous; inſtruction mingles with information: farmers are admoniſhed to ſecure their corn from the rain, and it being the month of September, to content themſelves with guarding againſt autumnal rains.

"Beware

"Beware of ſudden change ye prudent ſwains;
Secure the harveſt from *autumnal* rains."

In this paſſage we think the author himſelf a very prudent ſwain, in limiting his admonitions to ſecurity againſt the only rains that could fall. Theſe verſes appear to be formed on the model of Ambroſe Phillips.

The ſixth and laſt book commences with an obſervation that is unqueſtionably juſt. In winter, among mountains, farmers cannot work ſo much at their lands as in other ſeaſons. Froſt alſo binds up their hands from rural labour. Our poet introduces the amuſements of that ſeaſon of leiſure, delivers ſome obſervations upon fiſheries, and concludes with ſtating to our lawgivers the chief objects of political economy. The notes are much more voluminous than the poem, and contain many juſt, but common-place obſervations, and many repetitions of well-known facts.

From the ſketch we have given, our readers will ſee both the nature and our opinion of this performance. Mr. Campbell in his tour we thought a pleaſing, pains-taking, and in ſeveral reſpects, an uſeful writer. There he confined himſelf to ſuch a ſpecies of compoſition as decent abilities may, and did ſucceſsfully execute. But his preſent work propoſes to exhibit combined poetry, philoſophy, and political economy. The ſame impartiality which induced us to ſpeak favourably of his tour compels us, though reluctant, to declare our opinion, that his theme and object require much greater vigour of genius, range of knowledge, comprehenſion and depth of underſtanding, than he poſſeſſes. We adviſe Mr. Campbell to leave poetry, moral and political ſcience, and return to plain matters of fact, of which he has evinced himſelf an induſtrious and reſpectable compiler.

POLITICS.

A Reply to Lord Archibald Hamilton's Thoughts on the formation of the late and preſent Adminiſtrations. 8vo. Pp. 46. 2s. 6d. Ginger. 1801.

HAD this able Reply fallen into our hands before we had written our comments on Lord Archibald Hamilton's Thoughts, we ſhould have ſpared ourſelves conſiderable trouble, by oppoſing to his Lordſhip's looſe aſſertions, ignorant declamation, and groſs perverſions, the plain and perſpicuous ſtatement of facts, and the clear and connected chain of reaſoning, which preſent themſelves in the pamphlet before us. Mr. Pitt is here fully juſtified from the foul aſperſions and malevolent charges, which party without principle has preferred againſt him. We would extract largely from this part of the tract, if we had not before, on various occaſions, taken the ſame ground of juſtification, and nearly the ſame line of argument.

On the ſtrange aſſertion of Lord A. H., which we ourſelves noticed at ſome length, that "the juſtice or propriety of the excluſion of Mr. Fox in particular forms no part of the queſtion," his opponent is moſt juſtly ſevere. He places its folly and abſurdity in a ſtrong point of view; and, if his Lord-

ſhip have any of thoſe proper feelings about him, which every honourable mind muſt cheriſh, and which, therefore, we muſt believe his Lordſhip to poſſeſs, he cannot, we think, read thoſe paſſages without experiencing ſenſations of no very pleaſing nature. Moſt truly does our author obſerve, "It is impoſſible to allow the King the prerogative of chuſing his miniſters, and to queſtion his conſtitutional right of rejection: it ſhews, indeed, a bad cauſe to be neceſſitated to have recourſe to the device of ſecret influence; and I will venture to ſay, that argument would not have been made uſe of, had the political conduct of the individual excluded been in any degree defenſible." With equal juſtice does he condemn the novel and abominable doctrine attempted to be inculcated by Lord A. H. and the party with which he acts, "that parliament or the people have a right to preſcribe to the King in the choice of his ſervants, thereby rendering the prerogative a perfect nullity." He then notices the moſt ſcandalous perſonalities which have been adopted as ſubſtitutes for arguments, in diſcuſſing the queſtion of the royal prerogative; and in anſwer to the baſe inſinuation, that Mr. Fox's excluſion aroſe from private piques and prejudices, he juſtifies that meaſure on the beſt poſſible grounds. But having already diſcuſſed this queſtion in our review of Lord A. H.'s pamphlet, and conſidered it in the ſame point of view with our author, it is needleſs to re-ſtate it here. The attack of the prerogative, and the ſhameful attempt to force Mr. Fox into the cabinet, only ſhews "how ardently they deſire the prerogatives of kingly power to be dwindled away, and the head of the ſtate (to be) rendered a mere cypher."

Having ſhewn that no wrong was done by the rejection of Mr. Fox, but that, if it proceeded, as has been aſſerted from ſecret adviſers, thoſe adviſers are entitled to praiſe for the honeſty and wiſdom of their councils, he conſiders the reſponſibility ſaid to attach to thoſe, who, by adviſing the excluſion of Mr. Fox, prevented the formation of a broad and efficient adminiſtration; and he aſſerts, with great truth, "that if reſponſibility attaches any where, it attaches with [to] Mr. Fox himſelf; and that Mr. Pitt is entitled to the thanks, the praiſe, the prayers of the people, for having courageouſly ſtood forth the champion of his King and country at this criſis of peril and neceſſity, although deſerted by almoſt all his former able colleagues. If wrong is done; if the country is in danger; and if that danger cannot be avoided (what I by no means allow) without a broad and comprehenſive adminiſtration, I ſay that the reſponſibility moſt certainly attaches with the Grenville party, and [with] Mr. Fox himſelf." It appears to us, indeed, that it attaches even more to the former than to the latter. In juſtifying Mr. Pitt, (where he certainly ſtood in no need of juſtification,) for not conſenting to join the Grenville party in the attempt to force Mr. Fox into the cabinet, he obſerves, "It ſeems to have been quite forgotten by Lord Archibald Hamilton," who ſeems, in truth, to have forgotten every thing but his party and his object, "that there were *three parties* concerned in the tranſaction with which his Lordſhip is ſo much diſſatisfied. His Lordſhip, from a regard to the prerogative of the crown, in which I hope he is ſincere," (if he be, it muſt be confeſſed, he has an odd way of ſhewing his ſincerity,) "removes all cenſure from the King, and, as if of courſe, laviſhes it upon Mr. Pitt: aſſuming the propriety of the conduct of the *Grenville party*, his Lordſhip argues throughout, as if their excluſion was a *neceſſary conſequence* of his Majeſty's refuſal to admit their new friend; and as if their determination in this reſpect had been previouſly known to *Mr. Pitt*. In fact,

if

if this gentlemen is to be blamed, becauſe the adminiſtration was not formed upon the *most extensive basis possible*, it is to be attributed to the Grenvilles that it was not formed upon the moſt extenſive baſis, conſiſtent with the deciſion of the King, a deciſion ariſing from an opinion grounded upon their ſuggeſtions, and cheriſhed by their efforts.

" It appears, however, to be the political creed of ſome, that, if Mr. Fox and ſome of his party were not admitted into the cabinet, the old adminiſtration would have been highly injurious. So that they admire the Grenville party as Mr. Fox's ſupporters, but not as coming into office again with Mr. Pitt, and perfectly independent of the latter gentleman. But, at all events, it would have been poſſible to have formed [to form] a very comprehenſive adminiſtration without Mr. Fox, an adminiſtration ſtrong enough to have weathered the rougheſt tempeſt; and what then can have cauſed this ſudden change in thoſe noblemen and gentlemen whoſe names never have been mentioned but with admiration and reſpect."

If this were not poſſible, the country would be reduced to a lamentable ſituation indeed, and ſcarcely worth the trouble of preſerving. But how thoſe very men, who ſo loudly reprobated, as moſt diſhonourable and degrading to the nation, the idea that the ſalvation of the country could not be effected without the aid of *one man*, when that man was MR. PITT, can now maintain the ſame monſtrous propoſition, when that man is MR. FOX, it is impoſſible to conceive without the imputation of motives, which we ſhould be loth to aſcribe to any men of honour or even of honeſty. In the follwing prayer every good ſubject muſt heartily join:

" God forbid that the violent ſpirit of party, which has already diſplayed itſelf againſt men, of whoſe meaſures nothing is yet ſcarcely known, againſt men of tried uprightneſs, courage, and ability, may have the effect of doing the harm it ſeems at preſent likely to produce; God ſend that thoſe who have already formed themſelves into a ſeparate party may not prove themſelves a factious oppoſition to diſtreſs the King's government, when unanimity is ſo much wanted! And God grant that the life of our moſt valuable and excellent King may be prolonged in activity and vigour to a 'green old age,' without further vexations and perplexities to diſturb his repoſe!"

The plain unſophiſticated ſtatement, in the ſucceeding paſſage, is at once the beſt account and the fulleſt defence of Mr. Pitt's conduct on this trying occaſion.

" In a few words, the tranſaction, as it affects Mr. Pitt, was this: He had aſſiſted in driving from his ſeat the late miniſter, and in diſſolving the adminiſtration of which he was the head. Thus deprived of his miniſters, the King called upon Mr. Pitt to aſſiſt him in forming a new adminiſtration. Mr. Pitt (not at *a single interview, but by repeated efforts!!!)* endeavoured to convince his Majeſty, as he himſelf was convinced, that the MOST *comprehensive ministry* would be the ſureſt ſafeguard of the country. His Majeſty acceded to this opinion, *with one single exception!!!* An exception to the prejudice of a perſon, whom, of all others, it would have been moſt indecent and inconſiſtent in Mr Pitt to have *forced* upon the King, however ſtrongly he might feel the propriety of his admiſſion into the cabinet.

" He, therefore, reluctantly gave way; and proceeded to recommend the formation of a government, conſiſting, with that ſingle exception, of all the great talents of the country, when he found that the acceſſion of thoſe talents was refuſed. He heſitated not, under every perſonal diſadvantage, *excepting his own character*, which could poſſibly attend a miniſter in coming

into office, he took the reins of government with all the aſſiſtance he could procure. *He excluded nobody—the King excluded Mr. Fox—the Grenvilles excluded themselves.*

" He took from every quarter that *was open*, all the talent, influence, and character, he *could collect*, and formed the preſent adminiſtration.

" It is rather an unlucky argument to bring forward, ' that the conſtitution in *theory* acknowledges no ſuch thing as forcing the King,' when the *practice* of the oppoſition is directly at variance with it; and more particularly when their official print has (as producing a caſe in point, and as before noticed,) alluded to Lord Chatham *forcing* George the Second to admit him to his cabinet."

Purſuing this ſtrain of forcible argument, which it is much more eaſy to revile than to anſwer, the author proceeds to comment on the extraordinary conduct of the Grenville party, who, as he truly obſerves, " were always, *if poſſible*, more hoſtile to the conduct of Mr. Fox than Mr. Pitt himſelf." The juſtice of this remark muſt be evident to every one who has attended to the proceedings of parliament, from the beginning of the French revolution, to nearly the cloſe of the laſt ſeſſion, in which a moſt diſtinguiſhed member of that party repreſented Mr. Fox as " *the pandar of every base and sordid passion.*"

" Did not the preſent Preſident of the council, Lord Spencer, Mr. Burke, Mr. Windham, and others that could be named, leave Mr. Fox's party, thinking his politics dangerous?—Can all this be immediately forgotten?—or has any material alteration in that gentleman's political principles taken place?—any alteration ſufficiently decided and ſincere, to account in any way for the preſent co-operation of the Grenville party—ſo active—ſo unexpected—ſo extraordinary—*so unfortunate*;—ſurely none.

" Where then ſhall we ſeek a cauſe? In the danger of the country? No,—that we have already ſhewn is increaſed by it.—In an exceſs of private friendſhip? No,—that cannot be ſo quickly matured, or ſtand in the way of the ſafety of ſtate.—Can it be perſonal hoſtility to Mr. Pitt, who was ſo long their able, zealous, and active co-adjutor? Surely no;—for there, if any where private friendſhip ought to prevail. Their conduct then ſeems wholly unaccountable, and muſt prove highly injurious—they ſet the ſafety of the country upon the exertions of one ſingle individual, who has reduced the King to the neceſſity of excluding him from his councils*; and oppoſe Mr. Pitt, becauſe he has, under circumſtances moſt diſcouraging, formed the beſt adminiſtration he poſſibly could. Not merely Mr. Pitt, do they oppoſe—*No, their opposition in this particular instance, indeed, is against his Majesty; both within and without doors those whom of all others it least befits, league together to con-*

---

* " One argument for the admiſſion of Mr. Fox is curious, particularly as coming from a quarter formerly ſtrenuous for oppoſitions. They wiſh Mr. Fox to come in, they ſay not as deſirous of his ſupport, but as wiſhing to avoid his oppoſition; and yet they admire and extol the conduct of the Grenville party, for keeping out with Mr. Fox—for endeavouring to ſtrengthen (if not to create) an *opposition*—an oppoſition which it is their wiſh ſo ſtudiouſly to avoid, as highly injurious and detrimental to the country.—And again, they wiſh to have Mr. Fox a part of the miniſtry, to quiet him as a factious leader of oppoſition, and not have him as an enlightened ſtateſman, whoſe abilities are neceſſary to the ſalvation of the ſtate."

troul

troul the King's choice.—And yet Lord Archibald Hamilton tells us, that 'the conſtitution, *in theory*, acknowledges no ſuch thing as forcing the King.'—If the preſent adminiſtration is, in the opinion of the Grenvilles weak and inefficient, it is certainly owing to them it was not ſtronger—it is their fault that there were but two courſes to purſue—'a comprehenſive miniſtry—or a narrow one'—had they but ſo choſen, there might have been a happy medium—but, no—that ſome ſecret cauſe forbade.—And how infinitely greater a right have the public to demand a reaſon for the conduct of the Grenvilles now, than they had, when as the predeceſſors of the late miniſters, they reſigned their official ſituations!!!"

The pamphlet cloſes with ſome pertinent obſervations on the contradictory attacks on Mr. Pitt. Of the temper and ability with which it is written our readers, from the ample ſpecimens which we have laid before them, are as competent to decide as ourſelves. We ſhall therefore diſmiſs the ſubject with one remark, that amidſt all that has been ſaid and written reſpecting the motives which have influenced the conduct of Lord Grenville and his friends on this occaſion, the *real motive* has been kept entirely out of ſight. In truth, it will not bear the light; and it is, therefore, not wonderful that it ſhould be involved in darkneſs!

Letters intercepted on board the Admiral Aplin, captured by the French; and inserted by the French Government in the Moniteur, and two Supplementary Sheets, of the 16th September 1804. *Published in French and English.* 8vo. Pp. 170. Weſtley and Symonds. 1804.

THE peruſal of theſe letters might ſerve to gratify curioſity, if that curioſity were not checked by the certainty that the French government, with their uſual fraud and perfidy, have ſo garbled the original correſpondence, as to leave it ſcarcely cognizable by the writers of the letters themſelves. At leaſt, we are credibly aſſured, that this is the caſe in reſpect of ſome the letters. Lord Grenville Leviſon Gower has, we underſtand, been metamorphoſed into Lord Grenville; the letter of Mr. Welleſley, in particular, is ſaid to have been materially altered. This circumſtance, and our abhorrence of the practice of betraying private communications, ſo common in the preſent times, prevent us from entering into that minute examination of this correſpondence, which we ſhould otherwiſe feel ourſelves called upon to do. The letter of a Mr. Stuart Hall would have extorted ſome very ſevere animadverſions from us. As it is, we ſhall quote a ſingle paſſage, from a letter of Mr. Dowdeſwell to his brother Colonel Dowdeſwell. "To ſay the truth, and, if we are to judge by appearances, England, I believe, is in a ſtate of ſecurity. *We have, indeed, some traitors among us; the speech of* Sir Francis Burdett, *at the anniversary of his election, justifies the opinion; but the mass of the people is loyal.*"

POETRY.

Our Country: a Poem. 8vo. Pp. 22. 1s. Hatchard. 1804.

POETRY and patriotiſm have here combined to produce one of the mo energetic addreſſes which we have read for a long time. The poe is dedicated to the volunteers; and the bard has, with conſiderable abilit

enforced every motive and every conſideration which can operate on the heart and mind of a Briton, and rouſe him to thoſe exertions which, at this momentous criſis, are indiſpenſably requiſite to preſerve his country from the fangs of an enraged, vindictive, and implacable tyrant. The following invocation is highly ſpirited and poetical:

" Thou laſt abode! thou ever bleſt retreat,
Where genuine freedom rears her ſtormy ſeat!
Still may thy ſons their nobleſt efforts try,
Brave the proud foe, his menaces defy,
Defend their King, their liberty maintain,
And ſtay an odious tyrant's baleful reign;
Or, if high Heav'n decree an adverſe fate,
And Gallic legions trample on thy ſtate,
May the laſt Briton periſh in thy cauſe,
And only Frenchmen own a deſpot's laws."

In this truly patriotic wiſh every genuine Briton will cordially join. Of the fate which awaits the infuriate banditti of the Corſican uſurper, in caſe they ſhould land upon our ſhores, the following, we are perſuaded, is no exaggerated deſcription:

" As Egypt's ſtream, by mountain-torrents driven,
Burſts o'er its banks, and lifts its wave to heaven,
Chaſes away its peſtilential blaſts,
And o'er the plains a bounteous harveſt caſts:
So to their Country's aid her children fly,
And mad ambition, luſt, and plunder die.
Yes! ere within thy raging ſoldier's arms
One ſtruggling virgin yields her bluſhing charms,
Thouſands muſt periſh of our warrior train,
And gaſping Gauls innumerous load the plain.
Ere thy proud hand our Monarch's ſceptre bear,
And from his brows the golden circle tear,
A million free-born heroes bath'd in gore,
Our nobleſt bulwark, ſink upon the ſhore.
But how they'll fall thy conſcious ſoul ſuggeſts,
Th' undaunted valour of our freemen's breaſts,
The vigour of their arms, thy flight atteſts,
When late thy troops, near Acra's ſandy beach,
Ruſh'd to attack the town, and paſs the breach,
Firm as Leonidas great Sydney ſtood,
And ſtopp'd thy plundering march, thy courſe of blood.
E'en now my ſight beholds his lifted arm;
Though horror frowns aghaſt, his mind is calm;
Around the Turks his ardent eyes he rolls,
And darts a flood of valour through their ſouls;
They riſe! they conquer! fill'd with dark diſmay,
Thy vaunting legions backward trace their way:
Though light'nings glare, and thunders ſwell the ſtorm,
If freedom warm the breaſt, what cannot man perform?
Such are thy preſent foes, and ſuch require
A world in arms, whole ranks inflam'd with fire.

Let

Let Holland, Spain, and Italy combine,
With numerous armies to extend thy line;
Let flaviſh Europe countleſs hoſts prepare,
To whelm our Country in a flood of war;
Yet we will meet thee—Britons ſcorn to fly;
Free we were born, and free reſolve to die.
From Albion's ſhores thy vanquiſh'd ſquadrons hurl'd,
Shall prove a dread, a terror to the world.
And ſhould thy tyrant-foot our Country tread,
Thou too ſhalt fall immingled with the dead:
Here fade thy glories, here thy conqueſts ceaſe,
And hence the world ſhall hail returning peace."

The Chriſtian bard here checks his preſumptuous muſe, and reminds her, that if her God will the fall of freedom, reſiſtance will be vain; and exhorts his countrymen to implore *his* clemency and his favour, without which ſucceſs cannot be obtained, and ought not to be expected.

The *ſlave-trade* is here, unneceſſarily and abſurdly, introduced; giving a tinge of fanaticiſm to an effuſion of pure Chriſtian zeal. But we cannot dwell on a ſingle defect, where ſo many excellencies combine to extort our praiſe.

The Poetical Register and Repository for Fugitive Poetry, for 1801. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Pp. 510. 9s. Rivingtons. 1802.

The Poetical Register, &c. for 1802. Pp. 472. 9s. 1803.

The Poetical Register, &c. for 1803. Pp. 480. 9s. 1804.

THE firſt volumes of this intereſting collection were miſlaid, or they would have been noticed long ſince. We are happy to find an aſylum here eſtabliſhed for thoſe ſmaller pieces of poetry, which, though highly worthy of preſervation, would be otherwiſe loſt. It will ſerve as a ſequel to the collections of Dodſley and Pearch, the Foundling Hoſpital for wit, and Bell's Fugitive Poetry. Many of the original pieces, in theſe volumes, poſſeſs great merit; and the *fugitives* are ſelected with taſte and judgment. But amidſt ſuch a multiplicity of objects, ſo well deſerving attention, the taſk of ſelection is extremely difficult; and, beſides, were we to quote two or three pieces, and our limits would forbid a more copious citation, the preference would appear invidious. We muſt therefore content ourſelves with recommending the work to the public, as one which merits their patronage.

Original Poems. By Thomas Green Teſſenden, A. M. Author of Terrible Tractoration; or Cauſtic's Petition to the Royal College of Phyſicians. 12mo. Pp. 210. 5s. Hurſt. 1804.

IN a well-written preface to this volume of poems, Mr. Teſſenden makes ſome judicious obſervations on the growing importance of America in the ſcale of nations; and on the inadequacy of a republican form of government to enſure the happineſs or ſecurity of individuals in any territory of conſiderable extent. This laſt topic has been frequently diſcuſſed by political writers, and we think it will be granted by all men of reading and obſervation, that the increaſing experience of ages ſtrengthens the arguments of thoſe who have come to the ſame concluſions on the ſubject as our author.

However this may be, we heartily concur with him in the wiſh, that a cordial friendſhip and harmony may ever continue to ſubſiſt between Great Britain and the United States. On the Jacobinical adage, *vox populi vox dei*, the impious abſurdity of which is revolting to common ſenſe, Mr. F. remarks:

"The old maxim of vox populi vox dei is not true. The multitude are nine times in ten wrong in their meaſures. THEY MUST BE SAVED FROM THEMSELVES OR ALL IS LOST. Otherwiſe the cunning, flattering, fawning, hypocritical demagogue, *who is ever a concealed tyrant*, like Abſalom of old, ſteals their hearts, and makes himſelf the Cromwell or the Buonaparté of a nominal republic. Society cannot exiſt independent of a power to coerce and puniſh. If this power be not *delegated* and marked by ſtrict, known, and legal boundaries, it will be *assumed* by the moſt unprincipled perſons in the community."

The *imperial republic* of France affords a lamentable proof of the juſtice of this remark.

The major part of theſe poems are humorous, and are principally worthy of attention for their accurate delineation of ruſtic manners in New England. The patriotic ode at the beginning of the volume has much merit; and the few ſerious pieces that are inſerted exhibit a very favourable ſpecimen of the author's poetical talents, as well as of his political and moral principles.

Martial Effuſions of Ancient Times, addreſſed to the Spartan Hoſts, to excite them to valour and diſcipline in their conflicts with the Meſſenians; and preſcribed as permanent recitations by the Republic of Lacedemon, to inſpire their Youth with warlike ſentiments. From the Fragments of Tyrtæus. 24mo. Pp. 32. Hatchard. 1804.

THE martial ſtrains of Tyrtæus will be more highly valued *now* than in the late "weak piping times of peace;" and even Mr. Chalmers, we ſuſpect, will hail "the TYRTÆUS of the newſpapers" with leſs harſhneſs than during the "hollow-armed truce," which, though founded on a principle of "*moral* arithmetic," had nearly lulled this country into a ſtate of falſe ſecurity, that would have proved the death-bell of her religion and her morals, of her greatneſs and independence. The Fragments of Tyrtæus have been already given to the public in an Engliſh dreſs by thoſe able poets and elegant ſcholars, Meſſrs. Polwhele and Pye; but the preſent tranſlator had not ſeen Mr. Pye's tranſlation before he had completed his own; and Mr. Polwhele's he never ſaw. The *firſt* of theſe fragments he has executed with great ability, and retained all the ſpirit of the original; but in the others his efforts have not been exerted with the ſame ſucceſs.

DIVINITY.

Two Sermons, preached in the Pariſh-Church of Sutterton, near Boſton, in the County of Lincoln, April 8, *and* 15, *upon inſtitution to the Vicarage.* By the Rev. George Hatton, B. D. Vicar of Sutterton, and late Fellow of St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford. 8vo. Pp. 48. 1s. 6d. Kelſey, Boſton. 1804.

TO theſe excellent diſcourſes is prefixed a pious and affectionate addreſs to the pariſhioners of Sutterton, which beſpeaks the pure ſpirit of a genuine

nuine paſtor of the Church of Chriſt, and could not fail to make a ſuitable impreſſion on his flock. The ſermons themſelves diſplay the ſame ſpirit, and ſet forth in few words, and in ſtrong but plain language, admirably adapted to ſuch a congregation as that to which they were preached, the leading doctrines of Chriſtianity, and the principal duties of its followers. The difference between a lively and a barren faith is ably marked, and the Methodiſtical tenet of faith without works properly expoſed, without entering into the details of the controverſy to which it has given riſe.

"Be aſſured that, if the tree be corrupt, the fruit muſt of neceſſity be corrupt likewiſe. This may ſerve to ſhew you, in a plain and familiar way, the errors of thoſe teachers, (if any ſuch there be amongſt you,) who enforce the neceſſity of faith, but deny that of good works; as alſo of thoſe, (if any ſuch there be,) who perpetually dwell on the efficacy of good works, but deny the neceſſity of faith. As the tree is neceſſary to the production of the fruit, ſo is faith neceſſary to the production of good works; and as good fruit is a ſure teſt evidence of a ſound and healthy tree, ſo are good works the evidence of a ſound and lively faith. By ſo eaſy an argument might any man of the plaineſt underſtanding expoſe ſuch errors, and prove the neceſſity both of faith and obedience."

In the ſecond ſermon there are ſome juſt and temperate obſervations on the ſin of ſchiſm, and on the neceſſity of union in the Church of Chriſt. Both ſermons are highly creditable to the author's principles of piety, and extremely well calculated to conciliate the obedience, reſpect, and eſteem of the inhabitants of Sutterton.

A Sermon, preached in the Church of Louth, at the Anniverſary Grand Provincial Meeting of Free and Accepted Maſons, Auguſt 13, 1804. By the Rev. Thomas Orme, D.D. F.S.A. R.W.M. 510, and S. G. C. for the County of Lincoln. 8vo. Pp. 20. Sheardown, Louth; Boys, Doncaſter; Feraby, Hull; and Rivingtons, London.

THE learned preacher has done us the honour to take the following ſentence from our Review for March laſt, as a motto to his ſermon: "A *good maſon* can neither be a *bad man*, nor a *bad* ſubject. The baſis of maſonry is *religion*, and without *ſubordination* it cannot ſubſiſt." This aſſertion was not haſtily made. It was the reſult of a thorough knowledge of the principles of maſonry. On this ſubject our ſentiments perfectly coincide with thoſe of Dr. Orme, whoſe eloquent and impreſſive diſcourſe, from the 1 Peter, ii. 17. we have read with very great pleaſure. It exhibits a correct picture of the nature and effects of maſonry rightly underſtood and properly eſtimated. It is followed by a brief, but ſatisfactory, anſwer to the general objections againſt the inſtitution, moſtly urged by thoſe who are apt to argue ex abuſu ad uſum.

An Exhortation to the Britiſh Iſles: a Sermon, preached on Wednesday, October 19, 1803, *being the day appointed for a General Faſt.* By the Rev. J. Hodgſon, Maſter of the Grammar School, and Lecturer of the Pariſh of Holybourn, in the Dioceſe of Wincheſter. 4to. Pp. 22. Dimmock, Wincheſter; Collins and Eaſton, Saliſbury; Maud, Andover; Hollis, Romſey; Willmer, Petersfield; Roe, Alton; and Offell, London.

FROM the 4th, 5th, and 7th verſes of the fifty-firſt chapter of the Prophet Iſaiah, whoſe inſpired admonitions are ſo peculiarly applicable to the awful

awful occaſion, Mr. Hodgſon takes occaſion to impreſs on his audience a juſt ſenſe of the danger to which the country is expoſed, and the only means of averting it. Whether we conſider the matter or the ſtyle of this diſcourſe, it is but juſtice to pronounce it one of the beſt faſt-ſermons which have fallen under our inſpection. The preacher has taken a clear and comprehenſive view of his ſubject, ſupported all his arguments by ſcriptural authority, and enforced his precepts with true Chriſtian energy and zeal.

MISCELLANIES.

An Anſwer to Lord Sheffield's Pamphlet on the Subject of the Navigation Syſtem, proving that the Acts deviating therefrom, which his Lordſhip cenſures, were beneficial to our Trade and Navy, in the laſt War, and ought to be renewed in the preſent. By J. Cock, Commercial and Public Agent to the Corporation of Liverpool. Pp. 74. 8vo. 2s. 6d. Richardſon. London. 1804.

IN reviewing the work of Lord Sheffield, we delivered our ſentiments deciſively in favour of adherence to the navigation laws, and we ſtill entertain the ſame opinion; becauſe in commercial as well as political eſtabliſhments, we deem it ſafeſt to abide by the dictates of experience. Nevertheleſs, we muſt admit the production before us to contain as able reaſoning as can be adduced on the ſubject. The following is the amount of Mr. Cock's argument:

The permiſſion granted to neutral ſhips by the Dutch property acts, and ſubſequent ſtatutes, was contrary to the letter, but conducive to the object of the navigation ſyſtem; it promoted the export and import trade of Britain; it enabled our merchants to carry on all that ſurplus of trade which we could not carry on ourſelves; it increaſed our revenues in a ſimilar proportion, and effected this benefit to commerce and finance, while our own mariners were engaged both in trade and in war. The neutral carriers who were employed by Britain during the ſuſpenſion of the navigation ſyſtem, were ſo far from injuring our means of defence, that we were thereby enabled to ſpare a much greater number of ſailors from the merchant ſervice for the navy. The author brings a great variety of documents to prove that our commerce was much more flouriſhing during the laſt year of the war, while the navigation ſyſtem was ſuſpended, than during the moſt proſperous period of peace. We believe the FACT to be as Mr. Cock ſtates it, but we apprehend Lord Sheffield would *account for it* in a different manner.

Having attempted to demonſtrate that the ſuſpenſion was advantageous to commerce and naval power in the laſt war, Mr. Cock contends that it ought to be reſumed in the preſent, and ſeems to expect ſuch a renewal from the policy of Mr. Pitt. The chief commercial opponents of this ſcheme are the ſhip owners; Mr. Cock maintains that they would not be ultimately loſers by the project.—In the courſe of this work, Mr. Cock exhibits a very clear and vigorous underſtanding, with expanded views of the principles of commerce, and extenſive knowledge of its details. Though we cannot ſubſcribe to all its political concluſions, we muſt admit, that it is an anſwer well worthy of the production which it is intended to confute.

Observations on the Exercise of Riflemen, and on the Movements of Light Troops in general. By Serj. Weddeburne, of the 95th (Rifle Regiment. 12mo. Pp. 57. Scatchard and Letterman.

THIS little publication, from the pen of a gentleman who has been for some time employed in the instruction of different *Rifle Corps*, is much deserving of commendation. Its rules are simple and explicit, and cannot fail of being serviceable.

A Serious Address to the Public, upon the present Times: but more particularly to the religious Part of it. 8vo. Pp. 68. 1s. Rivingtons.

THIS truly pious and impressive Address deserves the serious perusal of every member of every class of society.

A Friendly Address to the labouring Part of the Community, concerning the present State of Public Affairs in Church and State. 8vo. Pp. 46. Hatchard.

THIS is really what it professes to be, and is well adapted to the understandings of that part of society to which it is immediately addressed.

Proofs of Holy Writ; or, England's Triumph over Bonaparte [Buonaparté] and his Armada, foretold, in Express Terms, Seventeen Hundred Years ago. 8vo. Pp. 19. 6d. Badcock.

THE manner of this performance is much too flippant and dogmatical for the subject. The writer, however, as will presently be obvious, is not void of ingenuity. He considers, that, by the beast with seven heads, is signified the empire which was founded by Charlemagne, and that the respective heads apply to the seven kingdoms of which that empire was composed. "This then being so," he observes, "it is not unnatural to conclude that France, which was indeed the principal and seat of that empire, is signified by the head which was wounded. The words are very expressive: 'And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.' Verse 13. Wounded to death indeed was that unhappy country during the first years of the revolution; nor in the bloodiest page of history can a period be found to which this forcible expression will so justly apply. But when she reared her head above the ocean of gore that deluged her plains, and bade the tide of human blood cease to flow; when, exerting all her energies, she repelled and discomfited the nations that were combined against her,—then, indeed, might her deadly wound be said to be healed; then, indeed, did all the world wonder after the beast."

Unlike the late Mr. Galloway, in his "*Commentaries upon the Revelations*," our author, instead of considering the *other* beast to be significant of *revolutionary France*, endeavours to identify it with Buonaparté. He explains its "two horns like a lamb," "to represent a *growing* power, weak and contemptible at first, like the horns of a lamb, but approaching every day more and more towards strength and maturity." Our author, however, agrees with

with Mr. Galloway in one point, viz. that the "mark" which the beaſt cauſed all to receive, has "a palpable alluſion to the national cockade and cap of liberty."—"And that no man might buy or ſell, ſave he that had the mark, or the name of the beaſt, or the number of his name." Ver. 17. "Could any words," aſks the writer, "be found to expreſs more ſtrongly the meaſures now adopted by the Firſt conſul? Beſides his own, and thoſe of his allies, are not the ports of every neutral power, that is unable to reſiſt his deſpotic orders, cloſed againſt the Britiſh, the only nation in Europe that diſdain to ſtand coolly by, and view his gigantic ſtrides towards univerſal empire?"

We now proceed to our author's grand explanation of the number of the beaſt.

Having noticed the ſolution of Irenæus, that the word Λατινος exactly amounts to the given number 666, if the letters be taken in Greek numerals, he ſays—

"Here the learned and pious writer has not explained to us the mode by which this intereſting prophecy is to be ſolved, but has, at the ſame time, given us reaſon to conclude, that the general belief of that age was, that it referred to ſome man, who in after ages ſhould ariſe, or be born in Latium. What elſe could by poſſibility have led him to fix on the word Λατινος, or man of Latium? Surely this of itſelf, coming from ſuch high authority, would, if other more poſitive proof were wanting, afford ſtrong ground for aſſigning this prediction to Bonaparte [Buonaparté]; who may, without any great licence, or ſtretch of language, be called a Latinus, or Italian, as a native of Corſica, which, at the time the Revelations were written, was under the dominion of Rome, and which, from its ſituation, manners, and language, may be conſidered almoſt as much a part of Latium, or Italy, as the Iſle of Wight is of England."

Having quoted the eighteenth verſe of the thirteenth chapter of Revelations,—"Here is wiſdom, let him that underſtandeth count the number of the beaſt, for it is the number of a man; and his number is ſix hundred three ſcore and ſix;" the writer proceeds:

"The only proper mode of counting the number having been exhibited above, nothing now remains but to conſider in what way a Greek author, as St. John was, would write the word Bonaparte [Buonaparté]. For to the ſcholar it is well known, that when the Greeks adopted foreign words into their own language, they diſfigured them in many inſtances ſo much that it was difficult, under the new form, to recognize the original word. To comply with this common mode of orthography, they would ſubtract or add a letter*; or, for the ſake of euphony, or to make the ſound an echo to the ſenſe, would change a vowel, double a conſonant, and, indeed, ſometimes go ſo far as even to omit or add a ſyllable. To the learned, examples of this are unneceſſary, and to the unlearned, would not be intereſting. Hence it is evident, that an author writing in Greek the name of Bonaparte [Buonaparté] would, in the firſt ſyllable, uſe ο inſtead of the ſofter ſounding ω, and double the ν, producing by this means, a ſtronger and bolder ſound, more ſuited to repreſent the character of the individual, whoſe appellation it is. For it

* A ſpecimen of this is ſhewn above in the word Λατινος, Lateinos; where, as may be ſeen, they have added a letter to the original word Latinos.

may

may be remarked, by the way, that the ancients had great faith in the virtue of names; and volumes have they written to ſhew the felicity of ſome appellations, and the misfortunes of others. Then in the ſecond ſyllable, it was more conſiſtent with the refinement of that language to change the α into ε, that in the pronunciation it might not claſs with the α immediately following it, and rendered ſtill more offenſive to their ears, by being joined with the ſnarling letter ρ. The proper mode of writing the name in Greek then is Βονεπαρτη, Bonneparte; and this variation from common orthography, therefore, ſo far from weakening the preſent demonſtration, may well be conſidered as a ſtrong argument in ſupport of it, ſince it is proved that this is the only way in which St. John could, conſiſtently with the nature of the language he wrote in, ſpell it, and his number he of courſe calculated accordingly. Beſides, it may be remarked, that by this mode of ſpelling, while the ſenſe of the two words * of which the word is compoſed, is ſtill preſerved, one of them is made French, and the other remains Italian, a circumſtance which puts beyond all doubt the propriety of the ſuppoſed orthography, ſince Bonnaparté, as a native of Corſica, and citizen and deſpot of France, and wiſhing himſelf to Gallicize his name †, cannot but be conſidered as a kind of mongrel, half one thing, half the other; and that it was particularly a cuſtom among the Jews, and that St. John was likely to avail himſelf of it, to change mens' names, and impoſe new ones, deſcriptive of their new ſituations, is evident from what he himſelf teſtifies of our bleſſed Saviour (the higheſt authority ſurely that can be cited), who, on the calling of Simon, the ſon of Jonah, to the apoſtleſhip, altered his name to Cephas or Peter, which is by interpretation a ſtone or rock, alluding thereby to the firmneſs and perſeverance, with which he foreſaw that Peter would afterwards diſſeminate his holy goſpel.

It being proved, then, that this is the proper way of writing the name, or at leaſt the way in which St. John would certainly write it; a ſpecification of the numbers expreſſed by the reſpective letters is all that remains to be done, and thus is the number of the beaſt counted:

B,	B,	2
O,	O,	70
N,	N,	50
N,	N,	50
E,	E,	5
Π,	P,	80
A,	A,	1
P,	R,	100
T,	T,	300
H,	E,	8
		666

* Behold then Bonaparte [Buonaparté] beyond all controverſy demonſtrated to be the beaſt, wantoning in power, and cauſing all the earth, and

* Buona parte, good part.

† By deſire, or rather command, of the Firſt Conſul, the final *e* of Bonaparte [Buonaparté] is dropped in pronunciation.

then

them that dwell therein, to worſhip the firſt beaſt, whoſe deadly wound was healed! Behold alſo the fate that awaits him! That remains not to be preſumed or deduced from probabilities; that is by the ſame inſpired writer already foretold in terms too unequivocal to admit of argument.

"And I ſaw, as it were, a ſea of glaſs mingled with fire, and them that had gotten the victory over the beaſt, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, ſtand on the ſea of glaſs, moving the harps of God." Rev. xv. 2.

"Can any doubt this application to be juſt? to whom elſe can be referred the expreſſions of the ſacred page? Who is at war with the beaſt? who dares to queſtion his authority, but England? What can the "ſea of glaſs mingled with fire" denote, but the horrors of a naval war fight? And who is likely to cope with France on the ſeas, but England? and, on the ſeas, oppoſed to France, can England be any thing but victorious?

"Nay, farther, the very arms of the United Iſles, and the very part of them, that an eaſtern writer would, in the political ſpirit of his country, ſelect, are clearly pointed out. The victors are deſcribed as 'ſtanding on a ſea of glaſs,' having the harp of God." Who is ignorant that the harp occupies a principal quarter in the Imperial Arms of the Britiſh Iſles? and is not the ſong which the victors are repreſented as ſinging exactly in the ſpirit of that gallant chief* who gained the glorious victory of the Nile?

"And they ſing the ſong of Moſes, the ſervant of God, and the ſong of the Lamb, ſaying, 'Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; juſt and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints! Who ſhall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy: for all nations ſhall come and worſhip before thee; for thy judgments are made manifeſt." ver. 3, 4.

Whatever opinion may be entertained of our author, as an expounder of propecies, it is obvious that he does not wiſh to be thought deficient in a ſhew of patriotiſm.

The Proper Names of the Bible, New Testament, and Apocrypha, divided and accented, with other facilities for their pronunciation, agreeably to the best usage, and to English analogy. To which is added, a Selection of some of the most beautiful Scriptural Pieces, calculated to instruct Youth in the art of Reading with propriety; and, at the same time, to inculcate principles of Morality and Religion, in which it has been attempted to shew the Learner the emphatic words in every sentence intended as a sequel to the Spelling-book; and an Introduction to the Scriptures, Speaker, &c. By John Robinſon, Author of the "New Engliſh Spelling-Book," &c. and Maſter of Arundel-ſtreet Seminary. 12mo. Pp. 182. Law. 1804.

MR. ROBINSON's alphabetical arrangement of ſcriptural proper names is very creditably executed; and, ſo far, he has rendered material ſervice to teachers as well as to learners. We cannot, however, approve of marking almoſt every alternate word by the Italic character. We conceive that it

* Alluding to the pious and remarkable expreſſions of Lord Nelſon in his diſpatches, which announced the victory he had obtained over the ill-fated Bruays at Alexandria.

muſt cauſe the learner to deliver his leſſon in laboured drawling tones, or with an inflated ſort of "no-meaning," which is far worſe than a monotony. There is alſo another objection to the redundant uſe of the Italic character, which we ſhall exemplify by an example from the book before us. When one writer attempts minutely to mark every emphatic word of another, the chance is greatly againſt him, however judicious he may be, that he will commit a multitude of errors. We ſelect the following inſtance, which we really have not hunted for, as a proof of this opinion. At page 97. Mr. Robinſon marks the quoted ſentence in the following manner:

"A labouring *man*, that is given to *drunkenness*, ſhall not be *rich*; and he that contemneth ſmall *things*, ſhall *fall* by little and *little*."—*Quere*, would not the following be the more correct reading?

"A *labouring* man, that is given to *drunkenness*, ſhall not be *rich*: and, he that contemneth *ſmall* things, ſhall fall by *little* and *little*."

It may perhaps be more tedious to the preceptor, but we conceive that, when the ſcholar errs in delivering the *meaning* of a ſentence, if his maſter were to repeat the paſſage correctly, and to accompany the repetition by an explanatory remark, the effect would be moſt beneficial. At the beſt, leſſons marked in Italics are but leading ſtrings, which there is much difficulty in quitting.

A Letter addreſſed to the Right Honourable William Windham, the late Secretary at War, on the expediency of allowing a drawback of the Duties upon Wines for the conſumption of the Army. Interſperſed with obſervations on the inſufficiency of Military Pay, and the preſent ſituation of the Subaltern Officers. By Lieutenant Fairman, of the Northamptonſhire Militia. Second Edition. 8vo. Pp. 88. 2s. 6d. Carpenter.

THIS pamphlet, we learn from the author's "apology," was written and printed in the year 1800; but, after a number of copies had been ſtruck off, it occurred to the writer, that it might be proper to ſubmit it to the judgment of the Right Honourable Secretary, to whom it was dedicated. From the correſpondence with which he was honoured, and from the unexpected changes which ſoon afterwards took place in the cabinet, he was, at that time, induced to ſuſpend the circulation of his tract, entertaining a belief, however, that the proffered advice would not be totally rejected.

The tendency of our author's arguments is, to prove the neceſſity of uſing wine in the army, the inadequacy of the ſubalterns' pay to defray the conſequent expence, and the propriety of government remitting the duties, or furniſhing them with an equivalent to their amount. His propoſal is, that every regiment or military-meſs, as well at home as abroad, ſhould be allowed, according to rank, after the manner of the navy, a *limited* quantity of wine, free of duty, for each member daily.

At a future period, we conceive the queſtion may be a fit ſubject for parliamentary diſcuſſion.

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

Biſhop's Skinner's Primitive Truth and Order vindicated. The Anti-Jacobin Review of Dr. Campbell's Lectures on Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and the Literary Journal, April 16, 1804.

WHEN we undertook the taſk of reviewing the periodical publications known by the titles of *Reviews* and *Magazines*, we little expected

ted

ted that any thing publiſhed under a ſimilar title, by C. and R. Baldwin, ſhould ever incur our animadverſion. Such indeed was our confidence in the well known conſtitutional principles of theſe gentlemen, that we have inſpected the *Literary Journal* but caſually, ſatisfied as we were that its object could not be widely different from that of our own Review. Great was our ſurprize, therefore, when a friend pointed out to us an article in that Jou nal, which, though the offspring of ignorance, is indiſputably of a pernicious tendency, and may, in fact, be productive of pernicious effects upon ſuch readers as cannot diſtinguiſh confident aſſertion from concluſive reaſoning.

The article profeſſes to be a Review of Biſhop Skinner's *Primitive Truth and Order vindicated from modern Miſrepresentation*; but it conſiſts in reality of a ſerious of falſhoods and impertinencies calculated to promote the cauſe of Methodiſm on both ſides of the Tweed, and indeed calculated to promote nothing elſe. We do not by this mean to inſinuate that the Reviewer is a Methodiſt himſelf. We rather ſuſpect him to be one of thoſe Scotch miniſters, or preachers, who, becauſe they poſſeſs a ſmattering of ſcience, aſſume the character of *liberal-minded divines*, and ſacrifice the fundamental doctrines of their own church to the reputation of *liberality*. But we beg leave to inform them, that a man may be ſkilled in various ſciences—be a good botaniſt, for inſtance, without being a divine; or an expert calculator of the value of life annuities, without being therefore deeply read in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Nay, a knowledge of the *German* and Latin languages is not enough to make a man either a divine, or an eccleſiaſtical hiſtorian; for authors of a very different character from the laborious Semler, or "the judicious Moſheim," muſt be conſulted by him, who would acquire a clear conception of the object for which the Son of God died on the croſs, or an accurate knowledge of the conſtitution of the Chriſtian church. Even metaphyſical acuteneſs, if not properly employed, will not enable the author of the beſt *diſſertation* that ever was written *on miracles*, or of the moſt luminous *philoſophy of rhetoric*, to underſtand "the myſtery of the kingdom of God;" whilſt the *affectation* of ſuch acuteneſs is very apt to make writers like our Reviewer confound the laws of that kingdom with the regulations of a literary or philoſophic ſociety; and expoſe their own ignorance, by writing dictatorially of what they have never ſtudied. Thus, in the very firſt paragraph of the Review before us, the writer, perſonating Biſhop Skinner, betrays ignorance, when he ſays,

"Let any community of perſons exiſt, who have only *one class* of religious inſtructors, and let theſe perſons believe the Chriſtian doctrine, and diſcharge the Chriſtian duties, more perfectly than any community of chriſtians has ever yet done, and let the teachers be the moſt wiſe, virtuous, and faithful which have exiſted ſince the days of the apoſtles, it is all to no purpoſe; ſuch teachers are no ſucceſſors of the apoſtles; nor do they and their adherents form any part of the church of Chriſt."

Had the Reviewer peruſed the biſhop's book with only half the attention which a critic ought to give to every book which he preſumes to characterize, he would have perceived that the Right Reverend author has maintained no ſuch ſentiment as this; and had he known any thing at all of the nature of the controverſy on which he ſo raſhly and petulantly decides, he could not have been ignorant that it is a ſentiment which never *has* been, and never *can* be maintained by any conſiſtent advocate for the *jus divinum of Epiſcopacy*. Such advocates do indeed contend that in the apoſtolical church there

there were three orders of miniſters; that the higheſt order *only* was ſent by Chriſt, as he was ſent by his Father, with authority to continue the ſucceſſion down to the end of the world; and that in churches where that order is caſt off, they can perceive no authority to adminiſter the affairs of the kingdom of Chriſt: but, as far we know, they have never maintained, and they certainly cannot maintain by fair argument, that the biſhops of any national church might not (we do not ſay properly) raiſe all the preſbyters and deacons to their own order; when there would, of courſe, be, in that church, a perfect parity of teachers all ſucceſſors of the apoſtles, and they and their adherents forming a part, however irregular, of the church of Chriſt. For fuller information on this ſubject, we refer the reader to the notes on Dr. Skene Keith's letter, publiſhed in our twelfth volume.

Another proof of our Reviewer's profound ignorance of the ſubject on which he has choſen to write, is exhibited in the following ſentence;

"We had formed ſo high an opinion of the knowledge diffuſed in the nation, as to believe that this wretched theory (the *jus divinum* of epiſcopacy) could no longer be maintained in the light of day, and that it was conſigned to the place of many other ridiculous notions entertained when the human mind had not yet emerged from the darkneſs of the Gothic ages!"

The theory was univerſally maintained, even by the confeſſion of Dr. Campbell himſelf, in the age of Cyprian. Did Cyprian live in the *Gothic* ages? It was maintained at home in the reign of Queen Anne, by the biſhops BULL and ATTERBURY, and POTTER and WAKE, &c. &c. by both the SHERLOCKS, father and ſon; and indeed by all the Engliſh divines of any eminence, HOADLEY, with a very few adherents, alone excepted; and it has been maintained, even in the Houſe of Peers, by ſome of the brighteſt ornaments of the preſent bench, not to mention a cloud of witneſſes among the inferior clergy. Is the age of George III. a Gothic age? Was the age of Anne the *darkneſs* of the Gothic ages in England? Or, were BULL, and ATTERBURY, and POTTER, and SHERLOCK, and GIBSON (living prelates muſt not be mentioned) Goths?

We are next told that the men of the preſent enlightened age "are convinced that the points, in which Chriſtians (we ſuppoſe *all* Chriſtians) agree, are the eſſential matters;" but we are *not* told what theſe points are; and that "they may be both pious and virtuous, adhering to *any* form of Chriſtianity, and by conſequence real Chriſtians!!" In other words, it is a matter of no conſequence, whether a man be a *Papiſt* or a *Proteſtant*; an *Arminian* or a *Calviniſt*; an *Epiſcopalian*, a *Preſbyterian*, or a *Congregationaliſt*; an *Arian*, a *Socinian*, or a *Quaker*; for there have been "men adhering to all theſe forms of Chriſtianity undoubtedly pious and virtuous, and by conſequence real Chriſtians!!" "It is a point we chiefly inſiſt upon," ſaid one of the founders of Methodiſm, Mr. Weſley, "that ORTHODOXY, or RIGHT OPINION, is at beſt, but a very ſlender part of religion, IF ANY PART OF IT AT ALL!"

We are next aſſured that the diſpute between Biſhop Skinner and his antagoniſts relates "to matters of *external* form; that it is of the ſame importance with the queſtion, whether Eaſter ſhould be celebrated always on one day of the moon, or one day of the week; and, in a word, that it is below contempt!" But to this confident aſſurance we can give no credit. Believing, as we have been taught to believe by the churches of England and Scotland, that "Sacraments are the viſible ſigns, expreſsly commanded in the New Teſtament, *whereunto is annexed the promiſe of free forgiveneſs of our ſins,*

and of our holineſs and joining in Chriſt ;"* that they "are truly ſigns and *ſeals of the covenant of grace*, immediately inſtituted by God, to repreſent Chriſt and his benefits ; and to confirm our intereſt in him,"† we never can ſuppoſe it a matter *below contempt* to enquire who has authority to apply theſe ſeals. Does the ſage Reviewer think it a matter of no importance whether the broad ſeal of England be regularly applied to any deed by the Lord Chancellor ; or clandeſtinely by his Lordſhip's footman, who may have ſtolen it for that purpoſe?

After ſome impertinent inſinuations of the uncharitableneſs of the Biſhop's doctrine, for a refutation of which we again refer the reader to the notes on Dr. Keith's letter, we are told that, in the primitive church,

"Dr. Campbell found, as many enlightened and impartial men had done before him, the learned and judicious Moſheim, for inſtance, and *the ingenious and diligent author of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, that a perfect equality exiſted between the teachers, and that every aſſembly or congregation formed an independent community, which acknowledged no authority ,except that of any eminent teacher, whoſe advice or reproof *it might deem it expedient or profitable to receive.*"

This is a very ſingular argument. The ingenious and diligent author of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, found, as he endeavoured to perſuade the public, that the Chriſtian revelation is an impoſture: is it therefore an impoſture? The amiable Fenelon, by being compared to whom Dr. Campbell is not ſurely diſgraced; and the celebrated Boſſuet, who ſurpaſſed Moſheim both in learning and in judgment, found, as they ſuppoſed, that the doctrine of *transubstantiation* is the doctrine of the Goſpel: is it therefore the doctrine of the Goſpel? With the man, who after reading with attention the acts of the apoſtles, the epiſtles of St. Paul, and the revelation of St. John, can yet join in the fanatical ravings of the miſſionaries concerning the congregational form of the primitive churches, and the perfect equality exiſting among their teachers, it would be idle to reaſon. We have ſaid enough on the ſubject in our ninth volume,‡ to which, therefore, we refer the reader.—We are next informed, that

"Dr. Campbell's lectures were probably drawn up at an early period of his life, when the abſurdity of the claim was not ſo generally ſeen as at preſent. The refutation is conducted with all that extenſive learning, and ſingular acuteneſs, for which the author was ſo remarkable; and certainly he often ſets the arguments for the jus divinum in a very ridiculous light."

At what period of the Doctor's life the lectures were drawn up is a matter of no importance, though we have reaſon to believe that it was at a period comparatively late. Of the extenſive *erudition* which they are here ſaid to diſplay, we have diſcovered no evidence; for we have traced almoſt all his quotations, and even all his reaſonings, to *Lord King*, and *Meſſrs. Clarkson, Baxter*, and *Anderſon*; and we appeal to any man of candour whether it was proper to ſubſtitute *ridicule* for *reaſoning*, when addreſſing a youthful audience on the conſtitution of the different churches eſtabliſhed in the Britiſh empire. The Doctor, however, found it eaſier, we ſuppoſe, to laugh at the arguments for the *jus divinum*, than to confute them by criticiſm and ſound reaſoning; and

---

* Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments.

† Weſtminſter Confeſſion.

‡ Pp. 115—117. and 235—238.

therefore employed againſt the liturgy of the Church of England the weap which he could moſt dexterouſly and ſucceſsfully wield. No; ſays this dicious Reviewer.

"That great and reſpectable body, the Church of England, the beſt and pureſt form of the epiſcopal polity, has no controverſy with Dr. Campbell on this ſubject. The divine right of Epiſcopacy is now as little taught by her enlightened and liberal ſons, as the divine right of kings.'

And who told him that her liberal and enlightened ſons teach not the divine right of legitimate ſovereigns? The church herſelf teacheth, as the ſcriptures taught before her, that God is the only ruler of princes;* that kings and princes, as well the *evil* as the *good*, do reign by God's *ordinance;* and that ſuch ſubjects as are *disobedient* or *rebellious* againſt their princes, *disobey God*, and *procure their own damnation*;† and it is to be hoped that none of her ſons, however *liberal* and *enlightened*, contradict the doctrine which they have promiſed to maintain. When the Reviewer affirmed that the divine right of Epiſcopacy is not now taught by any of her liberal and enlightened ſons, had he never heard of the Biſhop of Lincoln's *Elements of Chriſtian Theology* ‡? of the Biſhop of St. Aſaph's ſpeeches on this ſubject in the Houſe of Peers? of the writings of Daubeny, Boucher, Nott, Henley, &c. &c. or does he think theſe men leſs liberal, or leſs enlightened, than himſelf? But whatever be the teaching of this or that individual member of the Church of England on this ſubject, her own doctrine is clear and deciſive, as may be ſeen in the preface to her form of ordaining biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, which the reader will find at page 20 of our ninth volume; to which he is therefore referred.

Next follows a long and beautiful quotation from Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution, which has little more relation to the queſtion at iſſue between Biſhop Skinner and the partizans of Dr. Campbell, than it has to the civil conſtitution of the empire of Japan. It proves, indeed, to the conviction of every candid man, the propriety of conferring on the biſhops of every rich and luxurious nation, a high civil rank and large temporal emoluments; but it neither proves, nor by its author was it meant to prove, any thing elſe; and Mr. Burke knew well that the Chriſtian church had "a mitred front, though not to be exalted in courts and parliaments," before ſhe was incorporated with any ſtate.

---

* Morning Prayer.

† Homily againſt wilful Rebellion.

‡ The proof of the apoſtolical inſtitution of epiſcopacy to be found in this excellent Prelate's expoſition of the twenty-third article, is complete. Yet, becauſe he forbears to denounce anathemas againſt thoſe churches in which there is no Epiſcopacy, and becauſe he admits that the Hierarchy of the Eſtabliſhed Church of England, of which the Biſhops are *Peers of Parliament*, is not *precisely* the ſame as the Hierarchy of the church of Aſia Minor ſeventeen hundred years ago, he has been ſuppoſed to contradict himſelf, and to maintain that eccleſiaſtical government may be altered at pleaſure. There is nothing in the biſhop's expreſſions that amounts to this; but he has had ſuch ſpecimens of the candour of Calviniſtical antagoniſts, that we hope he perceives the neceſſity of making conceſſions with caution, and that in the future edition of his *elements* he will give greater preciſion to his language on this ſubject.

The reader has ſeen that our *judicious* critic conſiders the diſputes about church-government as below contempt; and yet, as if he had bidden farewel to modeſty and common ſenſe, he introduces, as of high authority, a quotation from Dr. Campbell's lectures, which begins thus:

"Permit me to premiſe in general, that the queſtion ſo much agitated, not only between Proteſtants and Papiſts, but alſo between ſects of Proteſtants, in regard to the original form of government eſtabliſhed by the apoſtles in the church, THOUGH NOT A TRIVIAL QUESTION, is by no means of that conſequence, which ſome warm diſputers, miſled by party prejudices, &c. would effect to make it." But this *no trivial* queſtion, the Reviewer has pronounced *below contempt!* Whom ſhall we believe? The learned principal; or his inconſiſtent panegyriſt?

We have next a groſs miſrepreſentation of Biſhop Skinner's meaning, as if he had claimed, which he no where does, the rights of an eſtabliſhment to his own church. That church, he ſays, was *once* eſtabliſhed; and what he ſays is true; but at preſent ſhe is what he denominates her—only "the *remains* of the old Eſtabliſhed Church of Scotland;" and is there any harm in this phraſeology? No; but it ſeems the Biſhop never calls the preſent eſtabliſhment the *Church* of Scotland! If this indeed be the caſe, and if the epithet was ſtudiouſly avoided, which we cannot believe, the Biſhop has certainly been by far too ſqueamiſh;—eſpecially as Dr. Keith, the biographer of Principal Campbell, has proved * that the Epheſian mob, collected by Demetrius, was a church!

Soon afterwards we meet with a ſeries of falſhoods, which no man *could* have advanced, who knew any thing of the ſubject on which this Reviewer has choſen to exerciſe his ingenuity. After telling us that the adherents of Epiſcopacy in Scotland, were, immediately after the revolution, but a ſmall proportion of the people, an aſſertion, which we have many reaſons to *believe* falſe, he adds another, which *cannot* be *true*. Part of thoſe Epiſcopalians, he ſays, "joined the Church of England, and erected chapels under the juriſdiction of the Biſhop of London;" but the Biſhop of London has not now, nor ever pretended to have, any juriſdiction in Scotland, as every clergyman in England knows, and as his Lordſhip himſelf will certify the Reviewer, if the queſtion be put to him civilly and reſpectfully.

We are next told, with ſhameleſs effrontery, that the Proteſtant Epiſcopal Church in Scotland receives "clergymen ordained by their own biſhops *only*;" though it is a fact known to us, and which may be eaſily aſcertained by the Reviewer, that there are ſeveral clergymen, who were ordained by Engliſh biſhops, juſt now officiating in canonical ſubordination to the biſhops in Scotland. There are others indeed, both of Engliſh and Iriſh ordination, who officiate in contempt of their authority; but theſe clergymen, and the Chriſtians to whom they miniſter, neither are, nor can be, under the juriſdiction of *Engliſh* biſhops, but are ſo many independent congregational churches, with paſtors epiſcopally ordained. A congregation in Scotland can no more be a part of the church of England than of the church of America; and if it be an epiſcopal congregation, and reformed, it muſt belong to the remains of the old eſtabliſhment.

But "this party has gradually dwindled and ſunk!" It has done ſo; and, in the lukewarmneſs of modern zeal, we are afraid that *any* party

---

* See our 12th vol. p. 215.

would

would dwindle and ſink under an *inſidious* perſecution of a hundred years duration. The Preſbyterian party had divided and ſunk to nothing under the perſecutions of the Scottiſh government in the reign of the ſecond Charles, till the exerciſe of the diſpenſing power by his brother ſet the factious miniſters free from their canonical obedience, and united the Preſbyterians with the Papiſts againſt the *then* eſtabliſhed Church It is to be hoped, however, that epiſcopacy in Scotland may gradually revive under the equitable toleration which it has now enjoyed for ten years; and in the mean time we cannot, with this Reviewer, conſider it the "obſcureſt and meaneſt of all "the Scottiſh ſects," becauſe it is the only Proteſtant ſociety diſſenting from the eſtabliſhed Church which the legiſlature has ever recognized. Of its knowledge or ignorance, as a body, we cannot take upon us to ſpeak, being acquainted with only a few of its members; but if theſe men be "deemed ignorant by the ſectaries in Scotland," what opinion muſt ſuch ſectaries entertain of this Reviewer?

It is true that the Epiſcopal Church in Scotland does not recognize the authority of any preacher of the Goſpel who received his commiſſion from a body of ſuch men as "Dr. Blair, Dr. Robertſon, and Dr. Campbell;" becauſe, like the Church of England, ſhe is bound by her conſtitution to ſuffer no men, within her pale, to execute any of the functions of a biſhop, prieſt, or deacon, who has not had EPISCOPAL CONSECRATION OR ORDINATION."* Did mere abilities alone authorize men to grant commiſſions to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter the ſacraments of Chriſt, a commiſſion granted by ſuch men as Blair, and Robertſon, and Campbell, would certainly be valid all the world over; but in that caſe, a commiſſion granted by ſuch laymen as NEWTON, BOYLE, and LOCKE, would be ſtill more valid. Yet we ſuſpect that the Church of Scotland would not recognize ſuch a commiſſion; and if our critic think otherwiſe, let him conſult her confeſſion of faith and other ſtandards.

This journaliſt, after ſome groundleſs complaints of "the kind of treatment which Biſhop Skinner beſtows on Dr. Campbell," informs the public, that "the Anti Jacobin Review of the Doctor's lectures is a criticiſm very little creditable to our publication." As we preſume to know as well as he does what is creditable to our publication, we beg leave to aſſure him he is egregiouſly miſtaken; and that the ſhare of credit allowed to that Review on the ſouth ſide of the Tweed, would have been ſufficient to gratify the critic who wrote, and the editor who inſerted it, had fame been, as it was not, the object either of the one or the other. But "the Biſhop and the Reviewer are parties equally concerned, and it is not wonderful that they ſhould remarkably approve one another." If by this inſinuation our critic means to ſay that the Anti-Jacobin Reviewer of Dr. Campbell's Lectures was likewiſe the Reviewer of Biſhop Skinner's book, he is again moſt egregiouſly miſtaken; but it is indeed true, that the Biſhop and both the Reviewers are parties concerned, though not all *equally* concerned, whilſt none of them appear to have provoked the controverſy. *We*, at leaſt, were dragged into it moſt reluctantly; and becauſe we dared to vindicate our own Church againſt the rudeſt attack that was perhaps ever made on the conſtitution of any religious ſociety, we have been abuſed and calumniated by Dr. Keith and this humble retailer of the Doctor's ſarcaſms. Biſhop

* See the preface to the forms of ordination, or our 9th vol. p. 20.

Skinner has ſhared the ſame fate, for doing what he was ſtill more imperiouſly called upon to do; and if theſe men may be credited, and mean as they ſeem by their outcries, Preſbyterians, Independents, Methodiſts, and Miſſionaries, have a patent to calumniate and laugh at the hierarchy of the Church of England, and of the Epiſcopal Church in Scotland, whilſt the guardians of the e two Churches muſt look on in *ſilence*, or forfeit all claim to *liberality* and *learning!*

In the preface to our firſt volume, we promiſed that "every effort to effect the ſubverſion of the Church of Scotland ſhould experience from us the moſt firm and vigorous reſiſtance;" and that promiſe we religiouſly kept, induſtriouſly avoiding *all controverſy* with her, till the publication of Dr. Campbell's lectures compelled us, in our own defence, to carry the war into the enemies' quarters. Even now it is our wiſh to drop the controverſy for ever; but if the caſe *muſt* be otherwiſe, if we ſhall be *again attacked*, or this attack be renewed, we beg leave to aſſure the public, that, truſting to the goodneſs of our cauſe rather than to any abilities which we may poſſeſs, we ſhall not ſhrink from a conteſt with the *wittieſt Doctor in Divinity*; the moſt *acute principal of a college*; the moſt learned *primarius profeſſor*; or the moſt *petulant journaliſt* which that Church may ſend out againſt us; and the only favour we have to aſk is that our opponents will be at pains to make themſelves, at leaſt in ſome degree, acquainted with the ſubject. "Though bad logic," as one of our greateſt Prelates well obſerved, "may aſk much dexterity to unravel; and old preſcription may require much erudition to expoſe its rotten grounds; yet ſpiritual, and we add profane, gibberiſh is ſtill better intrenched, and harder to be approached; for, having no weak ſide of common ſenſe—*recalcitrat undique tutus.*"

In the mean time we ſhall try to get rid of that dilemma which our critic is pleaſed to ſay "never can be got rid of by ſound reaſoning." If we derive the authority of our Biſhops from the Roman Catholics, then the Roman Catholic muſt be the true Church, and there could be no good reaſon for *diſſenting* from it. Or if the Roman Catholic be not the true Church, it is more than ridiculous, it is blaſphemous, to ſay that they had Divine authority to preach, and baptize, and ordain teachers." Such is the dilemma; and to get rid of it for ever, we have only to recollect that Aaron had a Divine authority to miniſter as High Prieſt at the very time he was forming the golden calf; that the ſons of Eli were *true*, though *not holy*, prieſts, when lying with the women at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation; that the Biſhops of the Church of Rome therefore may be and undoubtedly are *true*, though in many reſpects *heretical* Biſhops; that the authority of our Biſhops derived by ſucceſſion from them is as Divine as the authority of Phineas derived from Aaron; and that we did not ſeparate from the Church of Rome, but were driven from her communion becauſe we would not ſwallow all her abſurdities. If this be not level to the capacity of our critic, whoſe *perceptions*, like thoſe of Dr. Keith, ſeem not to be at all times *quick*, we beg leave to ſtate to him the following caſe.

Suppoſe the Scottiſh monarch, who, in "the darkneſs of the Gothic ages," is ſaid to have conſidered the ITCH as a luxury too great for a ſubject, to have been likewiſe a tyrant; it will ſurely be granted, that, during his reign, the government of Scotland was neither phyſically pure nor morally equitable. Had his ſon or grandſon, however, forſaking the infected palace, freed himſelf from the itch, and, by a proper courſe of ſtudy, acquired juſt notions of the duties of the royal office, and a firm determination

to

to practiſe thoſe duties, might not he, when the ſucceſſion opened to him, have been a rightful, pure, and merciful ſovereign, in conſequence of the *authority derived to him from his tyrannical and infected ancestor?* This, we ſuppoſe, will be granted by our journalist; but to be conſiſtent he muſt contend that the proper application of a ſufficient quantity of butter and ſulphur to the ſkin of any ſervant whom the Prince might have carried with him when he left the unclean houſe of his father, would have conferred on that ſervant an equal right to fill the vacant throne, and that it would have been, in fact, a matter of no conſequence to the conſtitution, whether the Prince or the ſervant had taken poſſeſſion of it.

Having thus diſpoſed of our critic's dilemma, we beg leave, in our turn, to aſk him a few queſtions. Are the ſacraments of the Church of any importance at all? Are they what they are ſaid to be by our two national Churches, or mere ceremonies, which may be complied with or neglected according to the caprice of every individual? If they be, as the Church of Scotland teaches, *ſeals* of the covenant of Grace, can they be adminiſtered but by authority derived from the Divine Author of that covenant? How is ſuch authority to be derived but either by lineal ſucceſſion through the Greek or Latin Church, or by immediate revelation from Heaven? From the civil magiſtrate it cannot be derived; for the Goſpel was preached, and the ſacraments adminiſtered for centuries before the Chriſtian faith was any where embraced by the ſupreme magiſtrate. It cannot be derived from the *people;* for if, in things pertaining to religion, *vox populi* were *vox Dei*, no divine revelation would ever have been given, nor could the Apoſtle have exhorted the Hebrew converts to "ſubmit themſelves to thoſe who had the rule over them, and watched for their ſouls." We propoſe, therefore, our dilemma to the critic and his friends. Thoſe who have authority to "miniſter either God's word or the ſacraments," can have that authority only by lineal ſucceſſion or by immediate revelation. Let them prove that thoſe teachers, who are not epiſcopally ordained, have their authority through either of theſe channels, and we pledge ourſelves never more to contend with them for any thing ſo inſignificant as will then be the external polity of the Church of Chriſt.

Buonaparte and the Monthly Review.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

AT a period like the preſent, when a diabolical and craſty tyrant is threatening us with momentary invaſion, and is attempting to blaſt the poſſeſſion of every bleſſing we at preſent enjoy, who meditates nothing but the deſtruction of our country, and would be delighted with nothing ſo much as to glut himſelf with Engliſh blood, it is the duty of every man, in one way or other, boldly to ſtand forward in its defence. It is not by dint of arms alone that we are to preſerve our preſent noble ſuperiority, but by taking every precaution in our power to prevent the *good fortune* which has been the lot of our enemy from appearing in the eyes of the multitude to be bravery, conduct, and military ſkill. The pen ought to be uſed by every virtuous man, not for the purpoſe of attempting to vindicate the character of ſo foul a tyrant, or through cowardice, or ſtill more deſpicable motives, to blunt the darts which truth may hurl againſt his fame, nor to palliate thoſe

deteſtable actions of which he has been guilty, or *Aikin-like openly to commend his conduct* *, but to ſet forth to public view the vile reality, unmaſk the infernal uſurper, and ſhew the world what ſort of a monſter now Hectors with deſpotic ſway over his miſerable Gallic ſlaves, and gnaſhes his teeth, with pain and unavailing fury, becauſe he is not able to break through a barrier compoſed of Britiſh troops, and add this country to the groaning train of his conqueſts. In the laſt *Monthly Review*, page 434, we are told by the Editor that, among the many ſentiments delivered by an *ingenious* and *liberal* writer, (whoſe work they review) the following words deſerve attention at the preſent moment. "Every one muſt allow that Buonaparté is a wonderful man, as well as a great general; as to his private character, it is no concern of ours; and as to his ambition, that is a paſſion from which ſcarcely any of the miniſters of great ſtates are exempt. There is neither *ſenſe* nor good manners in the perſonal abuſe with which the Britiſh newſpapers are filled againſt him, and I really think *it unworthy of the nation*."—The author of this ſentiment (his name is very wiſely concealed) is conſidered by the Monthly Reviewers, as *liberal* and *ingenious*! I conceive from this, that they concur in the ſentiment, which is indeed moſt *honourable* to them, and worthy of their ideas about ſome other *illuſtrious* and *infamous* characters towards the beginning of the laſt ten years. Let us for a moment diſſect and conſider the ſentence, "Every one muſt allow Buonaparté is a wonderful man." Granted; for, with the exception of Robeſpierre, and one or two more, the world has not ſeen ſo *wonderful* a character for ſome years. So *wonderful* a man is he, that without we had lived and ſeen, we could by no means have believed, that a man ſo *wonderful* could have exiſted. "As well as a great general;" that Buonaparté is as great a general as he is a *wonderful* man I beg leave to deny; and I appeal to military men whether he has not committed numberleſs miſtakes (and particularly about the time of the battle of Marengo) in his command of armies. Fortune has always ſteadily favoured this Buonaparté, but ſcience has not *always* been diſplayed in his military conduct, beſides the being a *great* general conſiſts, I conceive, not only in being ſucceſsful, ſcientific, and courageous, but in gaining every victory without the ſmalleſt poſſible effuſion of human blood. Let the *Monthly Reviewers* ſay whether this has been the caſe with Buonaparté? Whether he has ever regarded human blood, provided that he accompliſhed his ends? "As to his private character—it is no concern of ours." I muſt confeſs I hardly underſtand what the author means by his private conduct, I imagine, however, he means whatever he does which has no relation to England; if this is what he means, I inſiſt that it is *ſome concern* of ours; to hold forth guilt to public abhorrence is the concern of every man of virtue; it ought to receive the ſtigma of all the world. To be ſilent and unconcerned, whilſt we contemplate the moſt horrible crimes, is little better than to be an abettor of them. If vice (as it moſt certainly is) be pernicious to ſociety, it is the part of every member of ſociety to condemn, execrate, and expoſe it. "As to his ambition, that is a paſſion from which ſcarcely any of the miniſters of great ſtates are exempt." So this is the excuſe which the author makes for the miſchievous ambition that prompted Buonaparté to uſurp the government of France. This excuſe may be applied to any rebellious conſpirator who ſhould wiſh to exalt

---

* See ANTI-JACOBIN REVIEW, No. 72, Vol. XVIII.

himſelf,

himſelf, no matter by what means. Richard III. by this rule was not culpable, nor Robeſpierre, nor any other ſuch villains, becauſe, forſooth! ambition is a paſſion from which few great men are exempt! This ſentiment appears to me to have a highly miſchievous tendency. "There is neither ſenſe nor good manners in the perſonal abuſe with which the public newſpapers are filled againſt him, and I really think it unworthy of the nation." For the reaſons which I have before given, I think that there is great *ſenſe* in the expoſure of a villain in any and in every way whatever, nor do I do think it quite neceſſary for us to be upon the point of *good manners* with a perſonage who has ſhewn ſo little attention to them, with regard to England, in ſo many inſtances, one particularly in detaining a great number of Engliſh gentlemen and ladies priſoners in France, contrary to all the laws of nations and of civilized ſociety. How it is unworthy of the nation to ſhew in every reſpect how they deteſt and abominate a monſter replete with every thing that is horrible and accurſed, and make manifeſt in what light they contemplate a murderer, who has ſacrificed to his ambition (this *execrable* paſſion!) thouſands of miſerable wretches, not like an Alexander or a Cæſar, openly in the field of battle, men fighting equally for their own aggrandizement and glory, but with the poiſoned bowl and midnight weapon of the aſſaſſin. Did *Jaffa* too ſee her Turkiſh heroes die glorioufly on the field of battle? No; the poor wretches received, in cold blood, their death wounds from tha hands of a few miſcreants, hired to be ſlaviſhly ſubſervient to the commands of their barbarous and fiend-like maſter. D'Enghien has fallen beneath the ſame atrocious beaſt of prey; and a plot has but juſt been detected, the object of which was to poiſon the rightful monarch of France. Such is Buonaparté! Whether or not it is a breach of good manners, and an unworthy act publicly to condemn ſuch a character, let the world determine, and if it be the general opinion that it is not diſgraceful to attempt to palliate ſuch conduct, let the liberal author of the work before us, and his aſſenting commending Reviewer, be acquitted of the charge.

I have taken the liberty to ſend this to the Anti-jacobin Review, firmly perſuaded that to remark and cenſure ſuch ſentiments as thoſe I have juſt taken notice of will always meet with their approbation,—and I am, Sir, with reſpect, your obedient,

OBSERVATOR.

MISCELLANEOUS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

If you think the following letter worthy of publication, I trust to your impartiality to insert it in your Review. This being the first time of my addressing you, I take the opportunity of saying that I am an admirer of your magazine, which I have taken in from its commencement, and I wish you all the success you can wish yourself in the proſecution of it. I am Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

June 17, 1804. F. G. C.

TO BISHOP SKINNER.

Right Reverend Sir.

WHILST I ſincerely thank you for your able and ſatisfactory defence of Epiſcopacy in your late publication, allow me, with all due deference to your

your very reſpectable character, to make ſome remarks on a part of your concluding addreſs to the Epiſcopalians of Scotland. If, in the year 1789, you ſolicited relief for your church from certain penal ſtatutes, which relief was granted, in the year 1792, on certain conditions; your conduct, in not complying with theſe, appears to me rather unaccountable. I am far from calling in queſtion your affection and loyalty to your king; but although theſe are acknowledged in the preamble of the act, paſſed in the year 1792, for granting relief to paſtors, &c. &c. yet this acknowledgment cannot ſtand in the place of your formal compliance with the poſitive requiſition of the ſtatute; for I need not obſerve, that the words of the preamble contain the reaſons only for paſſing the bill, and do not comprize the conditions of it, which are mentioned afterwards. The belief which the King and Parliament entertain of your duty and loyalty as good ſubjects, may, I think, *ſtrictly* ſpeaking, be ſuſpended until you comply with the proviſions of an act, which, at your *own* requeſt, was paſſed expreſsly for your *own* benefit. If, as you ſay, "it be impoſſible that you could with any propriety, even on your preſent footing, of enjoying toleration only, refuſe to ſwear allegiance to a ſovereign, whom you love and reſpect and pray for, I am at a loſs to conceive why you do ſtill refuſe to ſwear allegiance to him, in the manner, and after the preciſe form (p. 424.) preſcribed by the ſtatute. And if this "omiſſion do not proceed from an unworthy opinion reſpecting the authority of government," from what cauſe, may I allowed to aſk, does it proceed! This omiſſion, you ſay, does not ſeem at all "peculiar to the Scotch epiſcopal clergy; as many of thoſe ordained in England, but who officiate in Scotland, will be found in the ſame predicament." (P. 473.) If they be, this circumſtance muſt be owing to their not having been preferred to any benefice, for without their having been appointed to this, no qualification, on their parts, is neceſſary. They have taken the oath of allegiance at their ordination. I do not therefore think with you, that all are included in the act of indemnity, becauſe your's is a peculiar caſe, and for you a particular Act of Parliament has been paſſed, ſuited to your peculiar circumſtances, and requiring proviſions neceſſary on account of theſe circumſtances. You have never taken the oath of allegiance at your ordination, and becauſe you have never been preferred ſince the year 1688 (nor can be now, in a country where Epiſcopacy is not eſtabliſhed by law) to an eccleſiaſtical benefice, a general act of indemnity cannot (I am humbly of opinion) include you in the number of thoſe who have omitted to qualify themſelves for offices according to law. "The Scotch Epiſcopal clergy," you ſay, "cannot refuſe to comply with the requiſition to ſubſcribe a declaration of the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, from any objection to the doctrine of the articles, but that the omiſſion muſt proceed ſolely from the difficulty of exhibiting this proof of their agreement in doctrine with the Church of England, before a civil magiſtrate in Scotland, who in that capacity is ſuppoſed to have concern only with the religious eſtabliſhment of his own country." (P. 478.) But it ſtrikes me, that you ſhould endeavour to do ſo, if you have not already made the attempt; for whenever you may think it proper thus to qualify yourſelf before a civil magiſtrate in Scotland, he, in receiving your act of qualification, or in regiſtering or recording the certificates of it, would, on that occaſion, I am of opinion, be doing purely a miniſterial act, and if he refuſed to do it, might be compelled by a mandamus. In this caſe, it is certain that he would have nothing to do with the religious eſtabliſhment of his own country, neither is it neceſſary that he ſhould, when acting

acting in a miniſterial capacity only, and according to the directions of a particular ſtatute. "Notwithſtanding every political difference has now been totally done away, the whole body of Epiſcopalians in Scotland can ſcarcely, I think, be conſidered as of one mind, and of one mouth, with reſpect to the government of their country," (p. 490.) whilſt one part of this body has *openly* and formally teſtified its allegiance to the ſupreme head of that government, and the other part has refuſed to do ſo. I cordially wiſh that all the Epiſcopalians in Scotland were firmly united; but allow me to ſay, that I think you have *not* made the firſt ſtep towards that union which is ſo much to be deſired by churchmen, unleſs you have complied with the requiſitions of the above-mentioned ſtatute. If you wiſh that the Engliſh clergy officiating in Scotland, ſhould formally teſtify, in the manner you require, their approbation and acceptance of thoſe unexceptionable articles of union which are ſtated in your Appendix, it is but fair that you ſhould formally ſwear allegiance to his majeſty, as they have done, and formally ſubſcribe a declaration of your aſſent to the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient humble ſervant,
F. G. C.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

SHOULD it not be foreign from the plan of your excellent work to admit the following remarks on the word *precedent*, by inſertion of this letter you will infinitely gratify a moſt ſincere and cordial admirer of your ſentiments, in the perſon of, Sir,

Your obedient humble ſervant,
June 12, 1804. QUONDAM COGNITUS.

PRECEDENTS.

What will in future make revolutions dreaded as the worſt evils that can befall ſociety?—*Precedent.*

What may in future be alledged in favour of accurſed blaſphemers, who ſhall impiouſly preſume to call in queſtion the exiſtence of the Divine Creator?—*Precedent,*

What poſſible excuſe may poſterity find for endeavouring, under the falſe maſk of liberty, and the abſurd idea of equality, to ſubvert every principle of virtue and honour?—*Precedent.*

What will make ſuch books as the Rights of Man and the Rights of Woman, and ſuch authors, deteſted amongſt mankind, as earneſtly deſiring to plunge their country into deſtruction, and to aboliſh all ſenſe of morality, of chaſtity and virtue, from the female breaſt?—*Precedent.*

What will cauſe the name of a modern philoſopher to be the moſt opprobrious epithet, that can be applied to a human creature?—*Precedent.*

What will ſhew in future that a complete deſpotic government alone is fit to rule over the abſurdity and thoughtleſsneſs of Frenchmen?—*Precedent.*

What will ſerve to ſhew that even the ſon of a petty-fogging attorney may by great luck, ſome ſhare of ability, and ſome military power, become a potent ſultan over many millions of abject, cringing ſlaves?—*Precedent.*

What will ſhew us that, provided a man be but a French Conſul, he may commit

commit the blackest crimes, the foulest murders, with impunity?—*Precedent.*

What will in future shew that in certain parts of the continent the sacred rights of hospitality are trampled upon, and despised, and find no protection against the attacks of the fiend-like Corsican?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that there are many people in the world, who would rather have the meanness to congratulate the perpetrator of the darkest iniquity, upon the success of his schemes, than have the spirit to avenge it?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that the fell ferocity of the tiger has been far exceeded by a demon incarnate?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that any foreigner who may be found in France will be instantly murdered?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that to be *a good sort of a man* is not the only qualification, by any means, for an able minister?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that very *moderate* ministers sometimes enrich their families with *sinecures* of 7000 l. per annum?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that the most upright, able, and dignified ministers are the poorest, when they have richly deserved every thing of their country?—*Precedent.*

What will hand down to endless posterity, that the name of Pitt is the most honourable title that a British minister can bear?—*Two illustrious Precedents.*

What will shew, that a Fox has been *hurt* in a Palace-yard?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that the most inveterate enemies may most cordially coalesce?—*Precedent.*

What will shew that in a large and populous empire there is scarcely a man who would not joyfully shed his last drop of blood to save a beloved prince of 66 years of age?—*Precident.*

What will be a witness that the same man can exist, and his idea be fondly cherished in many millions of hearts?—*Precedent.*

What will in future shew the wide difference between the true and the pretended patriot?—*Precedent.*

What emboldens a man to attempt to be great by imposing on the senses of the weak and leading captive popular opinion?—*Precedent.*

What will in future make a parcel of mechanics, farmers, and tradesmen, amuse themselves with marching about a country with red coats and firelocks on their shoulders, and be paid for their *actual* service by government?—*Precedent.*

What will in future make numbers of colonels and field officers of men who have scarce any other qualification for the office than being able to keep a horse?—*Precedent.*

What will shew in future that there is a system of volunteering which is full as liable to ruin the trade of their country as to preserve it?—*Precedent.*

What may be assigned as a reason by the ladies of posterity for departing from their proper sphere, throwing aside propriety and decorum, and engaging with the greatest eagerness in political controvery; and sometimes offering to the world letters attributed falsely to unfortunate princes?—*Precedent.*

What will make a Fox after having been always supposed to be violently fond

fond of *heat*, in a direct opposite direction, suddenly take up his station near the *north* pole?—*Precedent.*

What makes fashion govern the world, and gives its laws a power which the laws of nature and nations hardly possess?—*Precedent.*

What makes men pursue an ideal phantom of happiness, which they falsely imagine is existent in diſſipation and licentiousness, while they forego real felicity, which only can exist in virtue?—*Precedent.*

What is it that acquits rogues, and proves the lawyer to be a good and skilful one?—*Precedent.*

What emboldens a parson to preach other people's sermons?—*Precedent.*

What encourages whole nations to do all in their power to destroy one another?—*Precedent.*

What emboldens certain Reviewers to profess the most abominably jacobinical principles?—*Precedent.*

What encourages the author of this paper to send it to this repository?—*Precedent.*

Coincidences and Imitations.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

IF you ſhould think the following notes, made in the courſe of my lighter reading, worthy of a place in your miſcellaneous department, they are much at your ſervice. The preſent venerable Biſhop of Worceſter has ſo well laid down the diſtinguiſhing marks of caſual *Coincidences* of ſentiment and direct *Imitation*, that it is unneceſſary to obſerve under which claſs the following paſſages particularly fall.

That Pope pilfered from Chaucer, Craſhaw, Cowley, and Chapman, is well known to thoſe who are acquainted with their reſpective works. But I am ignorant whether it has yet been ſhewn whence he took the opening of his elegy to the memory of an unfortunate lady.

> "What beck'ning ghoſt, along the moonlight ſhade,
> Invites my ſteps, and points to yonder glade?"

It has been imagined that it was taken from Milton's Comus.

> "Of calling ſhapes, and beck'ning ſhadows dire."

But after reading the following lines, few, I believe, will be inclined to doubt that Pope was indebted to Ben Jonſon:

> "What gentle ghoſt, beſprent with April dew,
> Hails me, ſo ſolemnly, to yonder yew?
> And beck'ning woos me, from the fatal tree,
> To pluck a garland for herſelf and me."

See Ben Jonſon's Elegy on the Lady Ann Pawlet, Marchioneſs of Winton, edit. 1692. p. 577.

If any of your readers ſhould think fit to look at the edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays, in 1679, they will find, p. 27. col. 1. line 17. ab inâ, whence Pope took a line that occurs in his deſcription of the Cave of Spleen, in the Rape of the Lock.

The ſentiment in the compliment paid by Dr. Johnſon to Miſs Molly Aſton, is very ſimilar to that in the verſes by Dryden, on the Ducheſs of Bolton;

Bolton; but I doubt much whether the doctor had Dryden in his mind at the time.

Miſs M. Aſton, of whoſe wit Sir John Hawkins records Dr. Johnſon to have been a great admirer, was a violent whig, and of courſe a noiſy declaimer for liberty. Dr. Johnſon complimented her in the following epigram:

" Liber ut eſſe velim, ſuaſiſti, pulchra Maria,
Ut maneam liber, pulchra Maria, vale."

thus paraphraſed by R. P. Joddrell, Eſq.

" When fair Maria's ſoft perſuaſive ſtrain
Bids univerſal liberty to reign,
Oh! how at variance are her lips and eyes,
For while the charmer talks the gazer dies."

In Dryden's Miſcellanies, ſix volumes, 12mo. though I forget in which volume, among the verſes on the toaſts of the Kit-kat Club, will be found the following—

ON THE DUCHESS OF BOLTON.

" Flat contradictions wage in Bolton war;
Yet her the toaſters as a goddeſs prize,
Her Whiggiſh tongue doth zealouſly declare,
For freedom, but for ſlavery her eyes."

Congreve's firſt literary production, " *Incognita*; or, Love and Duty reconciled," is extremely ſcarce. I, who am ſomewhat of a book-hunter, never ſaw but one copy. It is probable Sir John Moore never ſaw it. Yet there is a ſtrong coincidence between the following paſſage from Congreve and *L'Amour timide*, by Sir John Moore.

" Telling him, that his paſſion was too ſudden to be real, and too violent to be laſting, he replied, Indeed it might not be very laſting, (with a ſubmiſſive mournful bow) but it would continue during his life."

L'AMOUR TIMIDE.

" If in that breaſt, ſo good, ſo pure,
Compaſſion ever lov'd to dwell,
Pity the ſorrows I endure;
The cauſe I muſt not, dare not tell.

The grief that on my quiet preys,
That rends my heart, that checks my tongue,
I fear will laſt me all my days;
But feel it will not laſt me long."

The following epigram was occaſioned by an offer from the Ducheſs of Marlborough of five hundred pounds for the beſt poem on the Duke's actions.

" Five hundred pounds! too ſmall a boon
To put the poet's muſe in tune.
That nothing might eſcape her,
Should ſhe attempt th' heroic ſtory,
Of the illuſtrious Churchill's glory,
It ſcarce would buy the paper."

But

But our covetous enemies on the other ſide the water, as ambitious of the empire of the world of wit as of the empire of the phyſical world, have thought fit to claim this as their own:

" On promit mille écus à celui qui feroit des vers, ſur les victoires du Prince de Condé, pour mettre en forme d'inſcription ſur la porte du Château de Chantilli; un Gaſcon fit ce quatrain.

Pour célébrer tant de vertus,
Tant de hauts faits, et tant de gloire,
Mille écus! morbleu mille écus!
Ce n'eſt pas un ſous par victoire."

In this paltry plagiariſm, to uſe the words of the author of the Critic, they have ſerved a good thought, " as gypſies do ſtolen childen, diſfigured it to make it paſs for their own." Where, by the way, let me obſerve, that " the Political Dramatiſt" is not ſo original as he would wiſh to appear; the idea, I am told, being taken from Cowley.

Goldſmith has been accuſed of ſtealing from the French poets, though, I believe without any foundation in truth. Yet there is a great reſemblance between theſe lines, taken from his " deſerted village," and the following from Les Poeſies de M. L'Abbé de Chaulieu, Epit. 1.

" As ſome tall cliff that lifts its awful form,
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the ſtorm,
Though round its breaſt the rolling clouds are ſpread,
Eternal ſunſhine ſettles on its head."

" Tel qu'un rocher, dont la tête
Egale le mont Athos,
Voit a ſes pieds la tempête
Troubler le calme des flots;
La mer autour bruït et gronde,
Malgré ſes emotions,
Sur ſon front élevê regne un Paix profonde,
Que tant d'agitations,
Et les fureurs de l'onde
Reſpectent à l'égal du nid des alcyons."

The following ſong, however well known, I hope you will reprint, that it may be more readily compared with the lines ſubjoined. I believe it has *hitherto* been conſidered as original. Will it be ſo any longer?

Dear Sir, this brown jug, that now foams with mild ale,
Out of which I now drink to ſweet Kate of the vale,
Was once Toby Fill-pot, a thirſty old ſoul,
As e'er crack'd a bottle, or fathom'd a bowl:
In boozing about 'twas his praiſe to excel,
And amongſt jolly topers he bore off the belle.

It chanced as in dog-days he ſat at his eaſe,
In his flow'r woven arbour, as gay as you pleaſe,
With a friend and a pipe, puffing ſorrow away,
And with honeſt old ſtingo was ſoaking his clay—
His breath doors of life on a ſudden were ſhut,
And he died full as big as a Dorcheſter butt.

His body, when long in the ground it had lain,
And time into clay had reſolved it again,
A potter found out, in its covert ſo ſnug.
And with part of fat Toby he formed this brown jug;
Now ſacred to friendſhip, to mirth, and mild ale.
So here's to my lovely ſweet Kate of the vale."

URCEUS.

" Plenus Falerno quem videtis Urceus,
Olim fuit Gubertus ille Noricus,
Qui ceteris bibacior potoribus
Palmam ferebat ſemper inter ebrios.
Is æſtuante ſole ſub canicula,
Dum mente læta, dum ſolutus omnibus
Curis vetuſto proluebat ſe mero,
Quo dulcius, fragrantius, potentius
Cretæ ſeraces non tulere pampini,
Clauſis repente faucium meatibus,
Et ſpiritu in præcordiis coercito
Dictæo bivit dolio tumentior.
Cujus cadaver ſaturo obeſius ſue
Cum molle tandem putruiſſet in lutum,
Rota peritos artifex volubili
Effinxit, hunc de expolivit Urceum,
Tuo, Lyæe, dedicatum nectari."

INTER CARM. HIER. AMALTHEI. 12mo. P. 25. 1689.

I am, Sir,
Your moſt obedient ſervant,
INDAGATOR.

London, September 19, 1804.

TO THE MIDDLESEX ELECTORS.

RANK, as the vapours from unnu tured lands,
What filthy crowds attend at diff'rent ſtands,
With fetid praiſe extolling Burdett's name,
And genuine worth attempting to defame!
From whence ſuch outrage, but to aid the cauſe
Of thoſe, who cheaply hold their country's laws?
Fair Truth and Juſtice for *their* nobler ends
Seek no ſuch aid, nor court ſuch *patriot* friends.
Firm in themſelves, impartial in their views,
What Honour dictates, each with zeal purſues.
With Freedom's voice they bid true Britons ſing,
England for ever! and, God ſave the King!

Kenſington. Auguſt 1, 1804.

EPIGRAM ON THE CORRESPONDING SOCIETY.

A race, in which but few could read,
Or write, I ween, a ſtroke.
Muſt make a curious ſet, indeed,
Of *corresponding* folk.

A.

Wolverhampton.